

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

Editors { C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.,
PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A., F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.), } Representing the Council of the
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. } Classical Association
J. D. DENNISTON, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of
PROF. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland, PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF. B. D. MERITT,
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume LX

APRIL 1946

Number 1

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	1
THE WANDERINGS OF IO: AESCHYLUS, <i>PROMETHEUS</i> 707-869. J. L. MYRES	2
AESCHYLUS, <i>PERSAE</i> , 320-2. H. D. BROADHEAD	4
ΦΙΛΟΔΕΙΚΤΗΣ <i>ΔΟΚΟΥΜΕΝ</i> (THUC. i. 77). E. G. TURNER	5
NOTES ON PLATO'S <i>SEVENTH LETTER</i> . R. S. BLUCK	7
NOTES ON THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT. R. L. DUNBAHIN	8
LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON DELPHIC ORACLES. H. W. PARKE and D. E. W. WORMELL	11
THE BELATED SPARTAN OCCUPATION OF DECELEA: AN EXPLANATION. E. T. SALMON	13
'COUNTERPOINT' IN ENGLISH AND LATIN VERSE. J. D. CRAIG	14
-ERE AND -ERUNT IN TACITUS. R. H. MARTIN	17
THE DESERT PIPE-LINE IN HERODOTUS iii. 9. A. MAUDE and J. L. MYRES	19
ARISTOTLE, <i>TOPICA</i> 107-8-10. W. S. MAGUINNESS	19
PAUSANIAS viii. 45. 1. F. JACOBY	19
PLUTARCH, <i>MORALIA</i> 520 F. W. MOREL	19
JUVENAL v. 103-6. D. S. ROBERTSON	19
QUINTILIAN xii. 10-27-8. R. G. AUSTIN	20
REVIEWS:	
<i>Sophoclean Tragedy</i> (Bowra), H. D. F. KITTO, 20; <i>The Manuscripts of Sophocles</i> (Turyn), D. S. ROBERTSON, 23; <i>Pindari Epinicia</i> (Turyn), F. MAAS, 24; <i>The Epitrepontes of Menander</i> (Murray), A. W. GOMME, 25; <i>Ἡ Ἀλεξανδρινὴ Πόλις</i> (Troadens), E. A. BARRER, 26; <i>A Historical Commentary on Thucydides</i> , I (Gomme), M. CARY, 27; <i>Plato's Examination of Pleasure</i> (Hackforth), J. TATE, 29; <i>The Riddle of the Early Academy</i> (Cherniss), J. TATE, 31; <i>Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy</i> (Cherniss), J. TATE, 32; <i>More Essays on Greek Romances</i> (Haight) R. M. RATTENBURY, 33; <i>Political Theory in Republican Rome</i> (Richardson), C. J. FORDYCE, 34; <i>Virgil: Eclogues and Georgics translated</i> (Treviñan), F. H. SANDBACH, 35; <i>L'Astronomie de Virgile: Géorgiques I-II</i> (d'Hérouville), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 37; <i>Seneca's Dialogues</i> (Alexander), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 38; <i>Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs</i> (Latimore), H. MATTINGLY, 38; <i>Modern Problems in the Ancient World</i> (Marsh), A. F. GILES, 40; <i>Polybe et Philostre de Bétie au III^e Siècle</i> (Feyel), F. W. WALBANK, 41; <i>History of the Roman World, 50 B.C.-A.D. 138</i> (Salmon), A. F. GILES, 43; <i>The Roman Law of Sale</i> (de Zulueta), A. H. CAMPBELL, 45; <i>Documents of Dying Paganism</i> (Friedländer), H. BUCHTHAL, 46; <i>The Horse in Greek Art</i> (Markman), J. D. BEAZLEY, 47; <i>Archaic Attic Gravestones</i> (Richter), J. D. BEAZLEY, 49; <i>Excavations at Dura-Europos: The Green Glazed Pottery</i> (Toll), F. N. URE, 50.	
SHORT REVIEWS	51
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	53
BOOKS RECEIVED	54

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 6s. 6d. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

Entered at Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

TH

THE v
tinent
reache
Études
throug
honour
took t
has al
Belgiu
appea
contai
it was
from
minist
les épi
les au
faire p
repres
in 19
appren
suivre
deman
Le con
qu'il n
citer q
résolut

Ere
numbe
using s
for 19
the six
stedt,
and Pr
tions b
are in
French

Most
had oth
in the
not all
immed
tenth-c
came t

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

APRIL 1946

NOTES AND NEWS

THE war-time numbers of several continental classical journals have now reached this country. The *Revue des Études Latines* has maintained itself throughout the war; the *Mémorial* in honour of Professor Marouzeau, which took the place of the volume for 1943, has already been mentioned here. In Belgium *L'Antiquité Classique* has also appeared regularly. Volume xii (1943) contains an inserted slip explaining that it was printed without authorization from the German authorities; 'l'administration s'excuse de ce que toutes les épreuves n'ont pas été corrigées par les auteurs: il s'agissait de ne pas se faire prendre.' The Belgian *Latomus* is represented by a single volume, produced in 1945; the editors explain—'Nous apprenions que, si nous voulions poursuivre notre publication, il nous fallait demander l'autorisation de l'occupant. Le comité directeur de la revue estima qu'il n'était pas de sa dignité de solliciter quoi que ce fût de l'envahisseur et résolut d'attendre des jours meilleurs.'

Eranos has produced its usual two numbers each year from 1939 to 1944, using six languages. The single number for 1945 is a Festschrift in honour of the sixty-fifth birthday of Einar Löfstedt, Rector of the University of Lund and Professor of Latin; of the contributions by his pupils and colleagues eleven are in German, six in English, three in French, three in Latin, none in Swedish.

Most of the Latinists in this country had other things than Latin to think of in the summer of 1939, and probably not all of them know that in the months immediately before the war a new tenth-century manuscript of Juvenal came to light at Belgrade and a ninth-

century Sallust in Rumania. Both discoveries were due to the enterprise of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, which was founded in 1937, and in 1939, having surveyed much of western and central Europe, was extending its explorations to the Balkans, where a hundred libraries were visited by its emissaries, and Italy. The aim of the Institute is to hold at the disposal of scholars of all countries complete information about all the Latin manuscripts in Europe, supplemented on the one hand by microfilm photographs and on the other by indexes of catalogues, medieval and modern (all these are also being reproduced on microfilm), of information about libraries, of incipits and explicits, of copyists, scriptoria and owners of manuscripts, of dates and places of writing. Printed and manuscript catalogues are all being checked at first hand, and many collections have been examined for the first time. From 1940 to 1945 the Institute was necessarily confined to the libraries of Paris; there the classical Latin manuscripts of the Mazarine, Ste Geneviève, Sorbonne, and Arsenal libraries, and most of those of the Bibliothèque Nationale, have been catalogued and photographed. In its early stages the Institute limited itself to non-Christian classical texts, but it is now extending its field to include all texts written in Latin to the end of the Middle Ages. In 1943 the number of manuscripts already photographed was 755 in France and 1,986 in other countries. At the end of 1945 the Institute had reproductions, in whole or in part, of 3,422 manuscripts on some 250,000 microfilm negatives. The Institute is housed at 87 Rue Vielle-du-Temple, Paris 3^e, and its Secretary is Mlle E. Pellegrin.

THE WANDERINGS OF IO: AESCHYLUS, *PROMETHEUS*, 707-869

THE description in the *Prometheus Vinctus* presents a sequence of geographical situations, loosely connected by phrases indicating the transit of Io from one region to another.

It has been suggested that over and above the grammatical break at 791-2, which does not interrupt the narrative, there have been extensive 'cuts' in our text, due to later stage-managers. But Aeschylus may be credited with some stage-craft, and any narrative connecting the fixed points in the text must have been only a selection among known *ἐοχάρια*.

It is submitted, therefore, that our first business is to make sense of the recorded text and discover what Aeschylus meant.

Two things are clear. Io must traverse the whole known world, if not a little beyond it; and she must traverse the localities with which her story had become connected in legend. Of these the three most important were the Thracian Bosphorus, the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and Canopus in the valley of the Nile. And the journey must begin at Argos (705) and end there in the fifth generation (854). It is suggested that all the difficulties in the first part of the narrative are caused by the double crossing of a strait between Europe and Asia; and all those in the later part by the attempt to encompass the whole known world.

We have, in any event, to remember that Aeschylus had neither Kiepert's *Atlas* nor the *Mediterranean Pilot*. His geographical notions and hypotheses were those of his time, as they may be collected from Herodotus and other fifth-century sources. I may be allowed to refer to an early paper of my own 'On the Maps used by Herodotus' (*Geographical Journal*, viii. 189 ff.), to which I have even now little to add.

Io leaves the inner world of Greek topography when she crosses Mt. Haemus, the Balkan frontier towards the region where Scythians wander, and

where none but Scythians wander because it is *ἄβατος ἐρημία*: reversing the role of Nebuchadnezzar, Io cannot maintain life there. Aeschylus did not always think ill of the Scythians: cf. fr. 203, *εὐνομοὶ Σκύθαι*, and fr. 198, his account of the *Γάβριοι* (Homer's *Ἄβριοι*, *Il.* xiii. 6).

From Haemus, then, her course is eastward (707) skirting the 'unploughed fields' of the Scythians, till she reaches the sea and crosses it—*ἐκπερᾶν χθόνα* (712) is not merely to 'traverse land' but to 'pass through and out of land' making use of 'surf-resounding reefs', *ἀλιστόνοις ῥαχίασι*, as stepping-stones. This can only refer to the Thracian Bosphorus, and the still half-legendary *Planctae*.

Io is now, therefore, in Asia, but there is no topographical detail till she passes on her left—i.e. to north of her (714-15)—the iron-working Chalybes of Pontus and western Armenia. She has therefore struck and followed the Royal Road, till it turned southward into Cilicia (Hdt. v. 49), and then followed the upper Halys valley into the highlands.

Here she encounters *ὕβριστήν ποταμόν οὐ ψευδώνυμον*, a paraphrase either of the Araxes (*ἀράσσειν*) or the Phasis (the 'loud-speaker', *φήμι*), which we know to have been for Aeschylus the boundary between Europe and Asia: *Prom. Sol.*, fr. 191:

τῇ μὲν διδύμον χθονὸς Εὐρώπης
μέγαν ἢδ' Ἀσίας τέρμονα Φάσιν.

This river she is not to cross, but to circumvent by its head-waters in Caucasus; which suits Phasis better than Araxes. She also crosses the lofty watershed of the Caucasus itself, and is in far-eastern Europe. How is she to get out, and by what 'southern road' (722-3)?

The clue for us, as for Io, is with the Amazons, not those who *will* some day settle (725) at Themiscyra on the Thermodon, and round Cape Salmydessus. They are not there yet, but in their

homeland, where Herodotus heard of them (iv. 110-17) three days east of the Tanais and three days north of Maeotis, beyond the Sarmatian country which lay between Caucasus, the Tanais, and the Maeotis gulf (Azov). They were thus in position to conduct Io across the Tanais, and so southwards along the east margin of the 'Scythian Square' of Herodotus (iv. 99) to the Perekop isthmus of the Crimea, and so to the Cimmerian Bosphorus, *ῥεῖθρον ἡπείρου ὄρον* (790). As the Amazons were friendly folk, it was only when Io left their country, at the Tanais, that she had need of 'guidance' along the 'southward path'. By the Cimmerian Bosphorus—and it was essential that Io should leave her name here—she again leaves Europe for Asia; and the first part of her mission, and of Aeschylus' lecture, is over.

The journey is resumed in 790, at the same *ῥεῖθρον ἡπείρου ὄρον*, and leads eastward. Io has reached her 'farthest north' at the Tanais; she has now to go east, south, and west. From the Cimmerian Bosphorus, crossing unawares her former track through Sarmatia, she crosses a stormy sea (792) which can only be the Caspian. Though Herodotus knew this sea to be landlocked (*ἐπ' ἐωντῆς*) it may well have extended far north for Aeschylus: at all events it bars the way from the Cimmerian Bosphorus to the Arimaspi (who for Herodotus are at two removes from Scythia, and two from the northern ocean) and fades into winter darkness. Thanks to Herodotus both the Arimaspi and the gold-guarding Griffins are relatively fixed terrestrial points, though *ἡλιοστιβεῖς* (781) warns us that the sun is here at ground-level; and in 786-7 we are beyond both sunrise and moonrise. Just as you could go 'beyond the north wind' and find *ὑπερβόρειοι*, so you could pass beyond the 'sun-trodden risings' into 'outer darkness'. These 'risings', as we have seen, are away to the north-east at the summer solstice; but it is not only here that the sun rises. The Gorgons, Phorcyds, and Graeae were usually set in the far west, beyond the sunset. By descent they are of the

outer ocean, and they are reported also beyond Libya. It was no great discovery that if you went far enough east, you would find them there too; the sun made that journey every night. No better proof of the extent of Io's travels. Herodotus, too, has the notion that *πρὸς τὴν ἡῶ* desert land goes 'ever so far' (iv. 40), though he does not locate the sun's rising-place.

Io has now to find her way back. She is not to go north-about, by the Arimaspi and Griffins (805-7), but to seek for a Black Folk, who likewise live *πρὸς ἡλίου πηγᾶς*. Now the sun has 'springs' far to the south of east, at the winter solstice: Io has therefore quite a considerable sector of Outland to traverse before she re-enters the *οἰκουμένη*. Where the sun came blazing up through the earth, no wonder if there was a 'scorched' river as well as 'scorched' people. From these easternmost *Αἰθίοπες* it was a straight course to the *καταβασμός*; not the escarpment between eastern and western Libya, known to later geographers, but the rugged sill through which the Nile descends into its trough. There is no need to print *βυβλίνων* with a capital; the papyrus-plant was characteristic Egyptian vegetation.

There was a good reason why Prometheus cuts short his *ὄχλον λόγων* at the Nile, and brings Io direct thence to Dodona (827-30). From fragment 196 of the *Prometheus Solutus* it is clear that a similar lecture was delivered to Heracles for his journey to the far west; and other fragments contain geographical references, to the Phasis (191), Scythians (203), *Γάβιοι* (198), and the Rhipaeian mountains (195, 197), as well as to the mouth of the Rhone (196), and to the western Ocean (192). The two passages are, indeed, complementary, like the digressions on Asia and Africa in Herodotus iii, iv. It would have been as easy for Aeschylus as for Herodotus to provide Io with a survey of the 'Far North' which lay beyond Scythia; but by representing the Scythians as inhospitable (in contrast to *Prom. Sol.* fr. 203) he has made it possible for her to traverse both the Thracian and the

Cimmerian Bosphorus without going that way. Scythia, as in the famous notice to tourists, was 'verboten—dangereux—there is no more to see'.

In view of these general considerations, then, there is no need to rely on

conjectural excisions to make dramatic sense of the text as we have it; while for the deliberate omission of the west we have Aeschylus' own evidence (827).

J. L. MYRES.

Oxford.

AESCHYLUS, *PERSAE* 320-2

Ἀμιστρίς Ἀμφιστρεὺς τε πολέπονον δόρυ
νωμῶν, ὃ τ' ἐσθλὸς Ἀριόμαρδος Σάρδεσι
πένθος παρασχών . . .

THE violation of Porson's law in 321 has caused many scholars to regard Σάρδεσι as corrupt. Prof. D. S. Robertson inclines to this view (see *C.R.* lviii. 34) and suggests Ἀσίδι. While admitting the force of the metrical argument, I think there are additional grounds for doubting the genuineness of the text.

(i) Warrior lists are given in the πάροδος, in the messenger's speech, and in the κομμός. Ariomardos, Tharubis, and Artembares are mentioned in all three passages. Artembares is a *cavalry* commander (29, 302); Tharubis, as a *spearman* (λόγχης ἄκμων 51), is, with Mardon, at the head of the Lydians and the Mysian ἀκοντισταί (49-52), and is commander of 250 ships (323). Ariomardos is the ruler of Thebes (38), is characterized as ἐσθλός (321) and ἀγαθός (968) and, in the present passage, is said to have brought grief to Sardis by his death. There is no reference to warrior-like qualities, or to a command over some portion of the Great King's motley host—surely a strange omission for a name considered important enough to be mentioned thrice.

In Herodotus' account there are two bearers of the name Ariomardos: (a) a son of Darius, in command of the Moschi (vii. 78), who carried shields and short *spears*; (b) one in command of Caspian *bowmen* (vii. 67).

Whether the Ariomardos of 38 is the Ariomardos of 321 or not, we do expect in the messenger's speech to find a more appropriate designation than that given by our text.

(ii) Further, even if the death of the 'noble Ariomardos' caused particular grief to Sardis, it seems strange that

such a description should be coupled with a reference to the prowess of Amphistreuus as a spearman. One would naturally expect Ariomardos, in the context, to be mentioned as distinguished for his skill with some other kind of weapon.

(iii) In the πάροδος, besides famed spearmen (51), Mysian javelin-throwers (52), we find βασιλῆς τοξοδάμαντες (25), and one warrior, ὁ ἐσθλὸς Ἰμαῖος (31), specifically mentioned as τοξοδάμας. The serious loss of the Persian τοξοδάμαντες is bewailed in 926. Inasmuch as the bow was peculiarly the weapon of the Persians and the Easterns generally (cf. 147 and 556, where τόξαρχος is applied to Darius), it would be strange if in the present list there were no reference to the bow.

I propose, therefore, to read Ἀριόμαρδος ἄρδει, and to translate, 'Amphistreuus, wielder of the calamitous spear, and the noble Ariomardos, who caused havoc with the bow' (lit., arrows).

In 320 πολέπονον δόρυ is commonly taken to mean 'the toilsome spear', but surely 'bringing much suffering' is more to the point. Compare τόξα πολέποννα (*Soph. Phil.* 777), 'bringing evil', αἰκία πολέποννος (*Soph. El.* 515), 'disgrace bringing trouble', ὄνομα πολέποννον (*Eurip. Hel.* 199), 'the name that brought calamity'. Similarly, πολύστονος means not only 'mournful', but 'causing grief', and is applied to ἰός and ἔγχος (see L. and S.).

If this is the meaning of πολέποννος we are prepared to understand πένθος here as 'suffering' rather than 'grief' (πένθος = πάθος). Compare Herodotus iii. 14 τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐταίρου πένθος ἄξιον ἦν δακρύων, where the word clearly means 'misfortune', not 'grief', and Pindar, *Isth.* vi. 52 ἔτλαν δὲ πένθος οὐ φάτόν,

where πένθος refers to the Theban defeat at Oenophyta.

πένθος παρασχών without a dative of the person (as in 328) should cause no difficulty; ὄχλον παρέχειν is so used several times (e.g. Herod. i. 86).

ἄρδης, which properly means the point of an arrow, is used for the whole arrow, just as αἰχμή, the point of the spear, is used for the whole spear. It seems to be an Ionic word, being found a number of times in Herodotus (e.g. i. 215, where ἄρδης and αἰχμή are mentioned together). As Ionic forms are frequent in the *Persae*, it is not surprising that Aeschylus should use an Ionic word for arrow, especially as the arrow was an all-important Persian weapon. In *P.V.* 880 ἄρδης ἄπυρος means an arrow-point

that has not felt the fire, i.e. the sting of the gad-fly.

After completing these notes I discovered that Porson (*Supplement to Preface to Hecuba*) believed that a line had fallen out, which he supplied as follows:

Ἀριόμαρδος, ἄρδῃων
βολαῖσι πιστὸς Μιτραγάθης τε, Σάρδεσσιν . . .

It is interesting to find that Porson's suggestion agrees with my contention about Ariomardos the archer.

The lines we have been considering (as well as some others) are bracketed by Paley. Perhaps the arguments I have adduced above tend to prove the genuineness of the passage.

H. D. BROADHEAD.

Canterbury College, Christchurch, N.Z.

ΦΙΛΟΔΙΚΕΙΝ ΔΟΚΟΥΜΕΝ (THUC. i. 77)

THE words φιλοδικεῖν and φιλόδικος are of surprisingly rare occurrence. Apart from the present passage and two unhelpful citations for φιλοδικία in the scholia to Aristophanes, I have traced only six instances in literature to the end of the fourth century.¹ Most enlightening is the use in Arist. *Rhet.* 1373^a35. Aristotle is analysing the psychology of wrongdoing, and here lists together common or easily concealed wrongs, thefts where the thief can easily dispose of the stolen property, wrongs where the victims are ashamed to come out in the open καὶ ὅσα φιλοδικεῖν δόξειεν ἂν ὁ ἐπεξιών τοιαῦτα δὲ τὰ τε μικρὰ καὶ ἐφ' οἷς συγγνώμη, 'wrongs which it would be thought litigious to prosecute—that is, petty or excusable wrongs', as Jebb translates. Again in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 1444^a30, where Aristotle, dealing with the structure of forensic speeches, outlines replies to a prosecutor's anticipation of a defendant's case, the following is given as an instance: 'If the prosecutor says we study and practise speaking, we shall counter ἡμεῖς μὲν οἱ μαν-

θάνοντες, ὡς φῆς, οὐ φιλοδικοί ἐσμεν, σὺ δὲ ὁ λέγειν μὴ ἐπιστάμενος καὶ νῦν ἡμᾶς καὶ πρότερον ἑάλως συκοφαντεῖν.' The sense of φιλοδικεῖν and φιλόδικος is that of entering on trifling or vexatious litigation, and applies only to the prosecutor. We may wonder, indeed, if in the first of these passages in coupling φιλοδικεῖν with δοκεῖν Aristotle had our passage of Thucydides in mind; and it is certainly not unlikely that there is a Thucydidean reminiscence in [Dem.] lvi. 14 (cited below) in view of the occurrence there of ἐλαττοῦσθαι also. We may also note in passing the countercharge of συκοφαντία in the second passage quoted, and may conjecture that this more pungent and picturesque word was preferred by the pleaders to the extrusion of φιλόδικος (apparently at first sight and explicitly on Aristotle's testimony a useful forensic stand-by).

The other examples without exception call for this sense of φιλοδικεῖν: Arist. *Rhet.* 1400^a19, the way to counter a charge of being φιλόδικος is by showing that there is no proof that one so charged has ever been engaged in a single lawsuit; Lys. x. 2, where the pleader explains the circumstances which have brought him into court, though his private opinion is that it is ἀνελεύθερον

¹ And none at all subsequently, though I do not claim an exhaustive search for the later period. For help in the hunt and the benefit of discussion I am grateful to Professor A. Cameron.

καὶ λῆαν φιλόδικον ('ungentlemanly, nay downright pettifoggery') to bring an action for slander; [Dem.] xl. 32, in which the pleader finds it absurd that other men when they consider themselves wronged καὶ τὰς πάνν μικρὰς δίκας εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐφίᾳσιν, while his opponent is content to acquiesce. 'Well, it will be said, ἀπράγμων γὰρ ὥσως ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐ φιλόδικος; [Dem.] lvi. 14, where the plaintiffs are ready to accept a temporary settlement without prejudice to further rights, ἡμεῖς μὲν ταῦτα συγχωροῦμεν, οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντες . . . τὸ ἐκ τῆς συγγραφῆς δικαῖον, ἀλλ' ἡγοῦμενοι δεῖν ἐλαττοῦσθαι τι καὶ συγχωρεῖν ὥστε μὴ δοκεῖν φιλόδικοι εἶναι. What, in fact, makes a man φιλόδικος is that he rushes to prosecute at law on a trifling pretext, to gain however slight an advantage or to avenge a fancied wrong.

I have laboured this point in order to demonstrate, on turning to the Thucydides passage, that the discredit of litigiousness has nothing to do with the judicial system established by Athens. φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν, on the analogy of the passages quoted, and particularly the echoes in Aristotle and [Demosthenes], can mean no more than 'we have a reputation for entering on (vexatious or trifling) litigation', meaning, as prosecutors against our allies. The fallacy here uncovered has persisted in and vitiated modern discussions of this passage, e.g. that of A. W. Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, pp. 236 ff.¹ It perhaps received its send-off from some remarks² of W. W. Goodwin in *A.J.P.* i (1880), p. 16: 'the charge of *loving litigation* was based chiefly on the profits which Athens received from having the civil suits of the allies tried in her courts', followed by quotations from Ps.-Xenophon, i. 16-18, on the *πρυτανεῖα*, the opportunities for protecting the friends of

democracy, etc., the gain in customs' duties, profits of lodging-house keepers, etc. But φιλοδικεῖν (or the English word *litigious* for that matter) does not mean what *loving litigation* means in Goodwin's sentence. φιλόδικος applies only to the chief actor in a legal suit, the prosecutor; *loving litigation* imports the external idea of spectators and connoisseurs of legal action—and (if the profit motive is admitted) of third-party profiteers.

In [Dem.] lvi. 14 the pleader says 'we thought we ought ἐλαττοῦσθαι τι καὶ συγχωρεῖν, in order to avoid giving the impression of being φιλόδικοι'; in Thucydides the Athenians, though ἐλαττούμενοι, do not escape such an imputation. Thucydides is in fact propounding a paradox. If his sentence is read again with an open mind it surely cannot escape notice how emphatic and παρὰ προσδοκίαν are the two words φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν.

Let us relate the sentence to its context. There is a certain balance with the immediately preceding sentence (76. 4), as Classen showed. Thucydides is giving an example of ἀδοξία¹ perversely accruing to Athens, and illustrating Athenian ἐπείκεια, which should have led to ἔπαινος: the main weight falls on φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν, where the choice of verb δοκοῦμεν glances directly at ἀδοξία, while the participles amplify ἐκ τοῦ ἐπεικοῦς. Strict correspondence would have called for something like ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις ἐπαίνου ἄξιοι ἔσμεν τυχεῖν ἀνθ' οὗ φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν. Thucydides discards exact balance and surely points his illustration (the perversity of human judgements about the Athenians, cf. *περίεστη*, 76. 4) much more effectively by jumping straight from ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις to φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν. The implied transition in this paradox is 'we Athenians who are at a disadvantage ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαῖς . . . δίκαις and in Athens have an environment of impartial laws (and have therefore less to gain or are under less temptation than anyone to undertake frivolous

¹ P. 237, 'The charge of litigiousness can only follow the establishment of courts in Athens'. I would, indeed, quarrel with most of this paragraph, especially with l. 11, 'We might have used force; instead we establish law-courts'; the argument is no more than 'instead we go to law (δικάζεσθαι)'.

² Carried to extremes by R. J. Bonner, *C.P.* xiv (1919), p. 286, who translates φιλοδικεῖν as if it were φιληλισσαι εἶναι.

¹ Not, as Gomme, *op. cit.*, p. 243, answering a particular charge.

litigation) . . . we are the victims of an imputation of litigiousness'. This transition is supplied by argument from τὸ εἰκός; and argument from τὸ εἰκός figures prominently in the next sentence.

This I believe to be the interpretation of Thucydides' words from which all juristic and historical commentary must start.

E. G. TURNER.

University of Aberdeen.

NOTES ON PLATO'S SEVENTH LETTER

335 a 7 sq. ὦν ὁ φιλοκρήματος πένης τε ἀνὴρ τὴν ψυχὴν οὕτε ἀκούει, εἰς τε ἀκούσῃ . . . ἀρπάζει πᾶν . . . τυφλὸς ὦν καὶ οὐχ ὁρῶν, οἷς συνέπεται τῶν ἀρπαγμάτων ἀνοσιουργία, κακὸν ἤλικον αἰ μετ' ἀδικήματος ἐκείνου, ἦν ἀναγκαῖον τῷ ἀδικήσαντι συνέφελκεν ἐπὶ τε γῇ στρεφόμενῳ καὶ ὑπὸ γῆς νοστήσαντι πορεύειν ἐπιμόν τε καὶ ἀθλίαν πάντως πανταχῇ.

THE above is the reading of Burnet's Oxford text. οἷς συνέπεται τῶν ἀρπαγμάτων ἀνοσιουργία will mean ἐν ἐκείνοις τῶν ἀρπαγμάτων οἷς συνέπεται ἀνοσιουργία. But the separation of ἦν from its antecedent ἀνοσιουργία by the κακὸν . . . ἐκείνου clause is surely impossible, and the want of a verb after ἤλικον is rather awkward here too. I cannot help agreeing with Harward that Post's proposals for reconstructing the text (*Thirteen Epistles of Plato*, p. 151) seem to add to its difficulty.

I suggest altering ἦν to ἦν, and placing the comma after it instead of before it. Then ἦν = 'has been', and ἀναγκαῖον agrees with κακόν. (The use of ἀναγκαῖος with an infinitive is, of course, not infrequent: cf. *Laws*, i. 643 c, *Gorg.* 449 b, and *Soph.* 242 b.) This alteration has, I think, the merit of simplicity.

332 c 6 sq. ἃ δὲ καὶ Διονυσίῳ συνεβουλευόμεν ἐγὼ καὶ Δίων, ἐπειδὴ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῷ συνεβήκει οὕτως, ἀνομλήτῳ μὲν παιδείας, ἀνομλήτῳ δὲ συνουσιῶν τῶν προσηκουσῶν γιγνόμεναι, πρῶτον . . . ἔπειτα ταύτῃ ὁρμήσαντα φίλους ἄλλους αὐτῷ τῶν οἰκείων ἅμα καὶ ἡλικιωτῶν καὶ συμφώνους πρὸς ἀρετὴν κτήσασθαι, μάλιστα δ' αὐτὸν αὐτῷ . . .

I give the reading of Burnet, who marks a lacuna after πρῶτον. Harward does the same. Novotný and Souilhé read ἐπὶ ταῦτα (no lacuna), but for this they have little authority (V, two 17th-cent. MSS.—U 29 and U 132—and a marginal note in O); and, as Harward remarks, it is not easy to see how such a corruption as ἔπειτα ταύτῃ (the reading of A: ἐπὶ ταύτῃ, O) could have arisen.

Post in his translation inserts in

brackets 'regulate his daily life', and Howald actually repeats words from 331 d 7 (ζῆν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν . . .: see below). Harward (*The Platonic Epistles*, p. 204) sees a sharp distinction between ἐμφρόνα and σώφρονα at 332 e 2, taking σώφρονα to refer to the acquirement of self-control, and ἐμφρόνα to the wakening of the intelligence by a course of study including geometry, and supposes that our 'lacuna' contained mention of this course. 'The missing words', he says, 'should describe the provision of παιδεία and συνουσία. These would include the much criticised course of geometry.'

Now φίλους ἄλλους . . . κτήσασθαι must surely supply, as Richards pointed out, the 'answer' to the μὲν clause at 331 d 7 (ζῆν μὲν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν πρῶτον, ὅπως ἐγκρατὴς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ὅτι μάλιστα ἔσθαι μέλλοι καὶ πιστοὺς φίλους τε καὶ ἐταίρους κτήσασθαι . . .). If this is so, the first thing that Dionysius has to do is simply to live his life well. That the obligation announced at 331 d 7 is here supplemented by insistence upon the need of geometrical and other technical instruction is made most improbable by the ἃ at c 6, which cannot include it: for we have heard nothing of it in the preceding remarks, which are the antecedent of ἃ. Plato might, of course, have forgotten the ἃ after writing three more lines, or allowed a false apposition between ἃ and the 'missing words'. But what need is there, if we keep ἔπειτα ταύτῃ, to assume a lacuna at all?

The MSS. do not show a lacuna, and the Greek as it stands makes perfectly good sense if we suppose that Plato is recapitulating after his remarks about Darius and Dionysius I (ὅπως μὴ πάθοι ἅπερ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ . . ., 331 e 2-332 c 6). ἃ δὲ . . . πρῶτον merely repeats

ζῆν μὲν . . . πρῶτον (331 d 7-8), to prepare us for the *ἔπειτα* clause. The first part of the advice is that Dionysius should live his life in such a way that the acquisition of trustworthy friends is possible, the second part (*ἔπειτα*) is to acquire them. *μάλιστα δ' αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ* (d 5) refers back to and repeats the first part of the advice, as being of fundamental importance.

For the juxtaposition of *πρῶτον* and *ἔπειτα*, cf. Thuc. v. 31: ἦλθε δὲ καὶ Ἡλείων πρεσβεία εὐθὺς καὶ ἐποιήσατο πρὸς Κορινθίους ξυμμαχίαν πρῶτον, ἔπειτα ἐκεῖθεν ἐς Ἄργος ἐλθόντες . . . Ἀργείων ξύμμαχοι ἐγένοντο. This letter is full of instances of an adverb at the end of a clause or sentence, cf. *ἀτιμῶς* at 329 c 4, *διαφερόντως* at 332 a 3, *νῦν* at 334 d 6, *καλῶς* at 334 e 1, *ἐνδίκως* at 335 e 1, and in particular the *πρῶτον* at 331 d 7.

There is no reason to suppose that *παιδεία* and *συνουσίαι* cannot refer to, or at least include, moral instruction; and there is no need to assume the distinction between *ἐμφρονα* and *σώφρονα* in which Harward sees the 'key to the passage'. In support of his contention Harward points to the use of *φρονεῖν*, 'which there covers the same ground as our adjective *ἐμφρονα*', at *Laus*, 711 e 7: there it is said that an ideal state can only come into being *ὅταν εἰς ταῦτο τῷ φρονεῖν τε καὶ σωφρονεῖν ἡ μεγίστη δύναμις ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ συμπέσῃ*. Now *ἐμφρων* and *φρονεῖν* may sometimes imply learning, but more often they imply ability or inclination to learn, and most often mere mental balance or stability. Cf. 331 c 7 and 351 d 2 (*σώφρων τε καὶ ἐμ-*

φρων with *δοῖος* in opposition to *ἀνόσιος*); and the frequency with which *φρονεῖν* and *σωφρονεῖν*, and again *ἐμφρων* and *σώφρων* are coupled is perhaps in itself significant. In the passages of the *Rep.* (v. 473 c f.) and of this Letter (335 d 2) parallel to *Laus*, 711 e 7, the word *φιλοσοφία* (not *σοφία*) takes the place there occupied by *τὸ φρονεῖν τε καὶ σωφρονεῖν*; and indeed it is quite clear from the lines preceding *Laus*, 711 e 7 (*ὅταν ἔρως θεῖος τῶν σωφρόνων τε καὶ δικαίων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἐγγίνεται μεγάλας τις δυναστείας*. . .), which 711 e 7 merely repeats, that the two verbs there coupled must be practically identical in meaning. L. and S.⁷ observe that *φρονεῖν* almost = *σωφρονεῖν* at *Soph. Tr.* 313; cf. *Antipho, Tetr. I. i. 1*. See in particular King Archidamus' speech at Thuc. i. 84. i-ii: *ἐλευθέραν καὶ εὐδοξοτάτην πόλιν διὰ παντὸς νεμόμεθα. καὶ δύναται μάλιστα σωφροσύνη ἐμφρων τοῦτ' εἶναι: μόνοι γὰρ δι' αὐτὸ εὐπραγίαις τε οὐκ ἐξυβρίζομεν καὶ ξυμφοραῖς ἥσσον ἐτέρων εἴκομεν*. Both words may have been in use to describe a special virtue of the Spartans, whom Plato admired so much. At *Phaedrus* 244 c *ἐμφρων* is contrasted with *μανεῖς*, and at 245 a *μανόμενος* is contrasted with *σωφρονῶν*. Cf. *ib.* 245 b and *Soph. Aj.* 82.

There is no reason why *ἐμφρονά τε καὶ σώφρονα* in our present passage should not simply refer to the advice *ζῆν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ὅπως ἐγκρατὴς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ* . . . (331 d 7-8).

R. S. BLUCK.

Haileybury College, Hertford.

NOTES ON THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT

δρῦς : *πέλτη* : *ἀνατείνω*

It may be justly objected to many articles in the new Liddell and Scott that the revisers have been too conservative. They seem to have felt that it was their duty to change as little as possible, and this has led them to retain errors that have long since been pointed out by scholars. Instances of this are to be found s.vv. *δρῦς*, *πέλτη*, and *ἀνατείνω*.

1. Under *δρῦς* we find 'II. of other trees bearing acorns or mast (Paus. 8. 1. 6), *πίερα δρῦς* the resinous wood (of the pine), *S. Tr.* 766; of the olive, *E. Cyc.* 615 (lyr.), *δ. θαλασσία*, = *ἀλίφλοιος*, *Ps.-Democr. Symph. Ant.* p. 5 G.' 'Bearing acorns or mast (Paus. 8. 1. 6)' has been added since the 7th edition; in that edition 'cf. 455' stands after E.

Cycl. 615 to justify the strange assertion that *δρῦς* can mean an olive-tree. In the new L. and S. 'bearing acorns or mast' is inserted for the same reason, though it should be obvious that neither pines nor olive-trees bear acorns or mast, nor are pine-cones or olives ever called acorns or mast. The reference to Pausanias is an instance of what Archbishop Whately in his *Logic* calls 'the fallacy of references', i.e. giving references which have no bearing on the case but which the incautious reader takes on trust as proofs of the statement which they appear to support. What Pausanias says is *ὁ δὲ τὸν καρπὸν τῶν δρυῶν οὔτι που πασῶν, ἀλλὰ τὰς βαλάνους τῆς φηγοῦ τροφήν ἐξεῦρεν εἶναι*. Here it is obvious that *δρυῶν* means oak-trees in general, including the Valonia oak, holm-oak, etc. The reference should come under I.

There is no reason whatever to suppose that in *Eur. Cycl.* 615 *δρῦς ἀσπετον ἔρνος* means anything else than 'a great shoot of an oak' (or 'of oak-wood'). It is true that in *Cycl.* 455 Odysseus proposes, like Homer's Odysseus, to use a branch of an olive-tree (*ἀκρεμὼν ἐλαίας*), but that does not make *δρῦς* an olive-tree. In Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 16, the wooden horse is made of silver fir (sectaque intexunt *abiete* costas), in ii. 112 of maple (trabibus contextus *acernis*), in ii. 186 of oak (*roboribus* textis), and in ii. 258 the door at least is of pine (*pinæ* . . . claustra); but no one would maintain that *acernis* means 'of silver fir' or that *pinus* and *abies* are two names for the same tree.

Again, in Soph. *Tr.* 766 there is no reason for supposing that *πιέρας δρῦς* means 'the resinous wood (of the pine)'. Jebb translates 'the resinous pine' and justifies his translation by the note: 'the wood of the pine (*πεύκη*) is resinous (*πητυώδης*)—a quality conducive to the bright flame which was prized as an omen. . . . The original meaning of *δρῦς* was simply "tree" (schol. *Il.* xi. 86; Curt. *Etym.* § 275). In 1168 and 1195 it means "oak". These are singular arguments. He does not attempt to prove that *πιέρας* means 'resinous' or that *δρῦς* means a 'pine'. The scholiast's

statement on *Il.* xi. 86, *ἦμος δὲ δρυτόμος περ ἀνὴρ ὠπλίσσατο δειπνον*, that *δρῦς* originally meant any tree, is merely a false inference from *δρυτόμος*. Homer uses the particular, 'oak-cutter', instead of the general, 'wood-cutter'; that does not prove that *δρῦς* ever meant merely 'tree'. Nor does the argument from etymology carry any weight. It is doubtless true that the I.-E. root *dru-*, *deru-*, *doru-*, did not originally mean an oak, but we are not in a position to say what it did mean; Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, connects it with Sanskrit and Zend words meaning 'firm', 'healthy'. That this root produced *tree* in English, *derwen* in Welsh, and *δόρυ* and *δρῦς* in Greek is certain; but that is not a reason for thinking that *δρῦς* could mean 'tree', still less that it could mean 'pine' or 'olive-tree'. Even if *δρῦς* had originally meant 'tree', that would not justify the inference that it had that meaning in Sophocles. The fact that *δρῦς* means 'oak' in *Tr.* 1168 and 1195 is surely a conclusive proof that it means 'oak' in *Tr.* 766. As for the argument from the flame, I know from experience that oak-branches will burn well while they are still green, if there is some dry wood to start the fire.

πίερα properly means 'fat' or 'rich' in metaphorical sense. Homer uses it as an epithet of land (*ἄρουρα, γαῖα, χθών*) or of a feast (*δαῖς*). Before translating it 'resinous', one should adduce some passage where it is an epithet of *πεύκη* or *πίτυς*, and even then it would not follow that it had that meaning with *δρῦς*. I take it that it means 'sappy' or 'full of sap'.

The case was put in a nutshell over sixty years ago by Lewis Campbell in his note on *Tr.* 766: 'Hermann, following a suggestion of the scholiast, imagines *δρῦς* here to be the pine, or rather a general word for tree. This is disproved by comparing *infr.* 1195. The oak is naturally preferred in sacrificing to Zeus. *πιέρας* then refers not to the special peculiarity of the wood, but generally to the sap or essential oil, or whatever the flame is supposed to feed on.'

As for *δρῦς θαλασσία*, since *ἀλίφλοιος*, according to the new L. and S., is 'sea-bark oak, Quercus Pseudosuber', this also should come under I.

2. Under *πέλτη* the following statement is retained from the 7th edition: 'II. = *παλτόν*, *shaft*, *pole*, X. *An.* 1. 10. 12: expld. by *δόρυ*, *ἀκόντιον*, Hsch., by *λόγχη*, Suid.' This is the only passage in which *πέλτη* is supposed to mean a spear-shaft or pole. It is obvious that Hesychius and Suidas were merely guessing; *δόρυ*, *ἀκόντιον*, *λόγχη* were three different things, and *ἀκόντιον* is clearly out of the question; so, for that matter, is *παλτόν*, for, if *πέλτη* did mean the pole on which the royal standard was hoisted, a javelin or a light spear (*παλτόν*) would not be suitable, since it would not be long enough for the purpose. The reference to *παλτόν* is unfortunate, for it suggests that *πέλτη* and *παλτόν* are connected etymologically, of which there is no evidence or likelihood. Further, as Xenophon uses *παλτόν* elsewhere, it is reasonable to suppose that, if he meant the thing here, he would have used the word. It is not reasonable to assume for one passage only a meaning totally unlike the normal meaning of a word, especially when the normal meaning gives a satisfactory sense. Why should a word meaning a light shield be used here to mean a shaft or pole? And if it were, how did Xenophon suppose that his readers would know that he meant a pole and not a shield, particularly as he had used *πελταστών* a few lines before (§ 7)? Is it not obvious that he would have used *δόρυ* or *κοντός* or *ξύλον*? Those who suppose that *πέλτη* could mean a pole or a spear-shaft in this passage forget that the meaning of a homonym is determined by its context. The sentence 'I want a good fencer' can have two absolutely distinct meanings. But if it occurs in a novel which deals with Italy in the sixteenth century, we know at once that the fencer is one who is skilful with a foil, whereas, if we meet with it in a story of modern Australia, we know that the man wanted is one who can put up fences. So here the description of the battle and battlefield and the men-

tion of peltasts make it necessary to take *πέλτη* in its ordinary sense. No doubt it was fastened to a spear or pole, but that does not make *πέλτη* a pole. See the note in Rehdantz and Carnuth's edition, revised by Richter (1912), or that of A. S. Walpole in his edition of *Anab.* i (1894). The former say: '*πέλτη*, der leichte Schild, nach dem die Peltasten genannt sind, bedeutet hier ein rechteckiges, schildartiges Brett, auf dem jener *αἰετός ἀνατεταμένος* (mit ausgebreiteten Flügeln) angebracht war. Es war an einer Lanze, unmittelbar unter der Spitze, befestigt.' Walpole says: 'It is by no means certain that *ἐπὶ πέλτης* does not mean as usual "on a shield", the signification "spear" by which Hesychius and Suidas explain being invented to suit this passage.' But for the whole truth one must go back more than seventy years to J. F. Macmichael's edition of the *Anabasis* (new ed. 1872, repr. 1881). He says: 'The eagle was apparently perched on a buckler fixed to the end of a pole or spear, by which it was elevated: this pole is sufficiently implied in *ἀνατεταμένον*, stretched or hoisted up.'

3. Under *ἀνατείνω* we find 'I. 1. *lift up*, *χείρας* *ἀ.*, in swearing, Pi. O. 7. 65; also in prayer, Id. I. 6 (5). 41; *εὐξόμεθ'* . . . *ἀνατείνοντες τὴν χεῖρ'* Ar. *Av.* 623; as token of assent in voting, X. *An.* 5. 6. 33, etc.', and 'II. *spread out*, *expand*, e.g. a line of battle, τὰ κέρατα, X. *Cyr.* 7. 1. 6, cf. ib. 23; *αἰετός ἐπὶ δόρατος ἀνατεταμένος*, *spread eagle*, ib. 4; *ἀ. ἰστία πρὸς ζυγόν* Pi. N. 5. 51'. Under I. 1 the 7th edition has '*to stretch up*, *lift or hold up*'; 'hold up' should not have been omitted in the new edition, since this is the idiomatic equivalent of *ἀνατείνω* when it refers to voting. The passages cited are the same as in the 7th edition. Under I. 1 it should have been mentioned that Xenophon uses *ἀνατείνω* of lifting the hands for other purposes than voting. And under II the force of *ἀνα-* is neglected. The meaning of the word may be seen from the following passages in Xenophon. Under I. 1 we have *Anab.* 3. 2. 9, καὶ ὅτω δοκεῖ ταῦτ', ἔφη, ἀνατευνάτω τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἀνέτειναν ἅπαντες, ibid. 33, καὶ ὅτω δοκεῖ

ταῦτ'
πάντ'
τεινά
ἐφη,
ἀπαν
δοκε
also
πρὸς
oath
τεῖνα
frien
(of s
1. 3,
παίσ
from
mean
quen
phon
prefi
No
we fi
πτήρ
πτον
(of th
τὰ κέ
πλαγ
in §
νομίσι
μίων
ἢ τὰ
σημεί
αὐτοῦ
clear
εσθαι
mean
the fl
longe

THE f
in Li
gested
the e
All th
meter
1. 6
239 d
διπτε
dued

1 δις
'fallen
ναῶν π
buted t

ταῦτα, ἀνατεινάτω τὴν χεῖρα. ἀνέτειναν πάντες, *ibid.* § 38, ὅτω δοκεῖ ταῦτα, ἀνατεινάτω τὴν χεῖρα, 5. 6. 33, καὶ ὅτω δοκεῖ, ἔφη, ταῦτα, ἀράτω τὴν χεῖρα. ἀνέτειναν ἅπαντες, 7. 3. 6, καὶ ὅτω γε, ἔφη, ταῦτα δοκεῖ, ἀράτω τὴν χεῖρα. ἀνέτειναν ἅπαντες, also *Cyr.* 6. 1. 3, ἀνατείνας τὰς χεῖρας πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀπώμοσεν . . . (of an oath), 4. 2. 17 and 18, τὰς δεξιὰς ἀνατείνας (as a sign that they were friends), 6. 3. 13, ἀνατείναντες τὰς δεξιὰς (of soldiers who desert or surrender), 4. 1. 3, ἀνατεταμένος οὗτος τὴν μάχαιραν ὡς παίσων πολέμιον. Here are ten examples from Xenophon of ἀνατείνω with the meaning *hold up* or *lift up*; their frequency is a reason for expecting Xenophon not to neglect the force of the prefix in derivative senses.

Now we come to II. In *Cyr.* 7. 1. 6 we find κατανοῶν δὲ ὡς πρόσω τὸν καμπτήρα ἐκατέρωθεν ἐποιήσαντο περὶ ὃν κάμπτοντες ἀνέτεινον τὰ κέρατα, and in § 7 (of the same manœuvre) ἡνίκα ἀνγέγνωνται τὰ κέρατα ἀναβαίνοντα κατ' ἀντιπέρas τῶν πλαγίων τοῦ ἡμετέρου στρατεύματος, and in § 23 (still of the same manœuvre) νομίσας ἥδη ἐγγύτερον εἶναι τῶν πολέμιων τὴν φάλαγγα σὺν ἣ αὐτὸς ἐπορεύετο ἢ τὰ ἀνατεινόμενα κέρατα, ἦρε τοῖς κέρασι σημείον μηκέτι ἄνω πορεύεσθαι, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ ἐν χώρᾳ στραφῆναι. Here it seems clear from ἀναβαίνοντα and ἄνω πορεύεσθαι that ἀνέτεινον τὰ κέρατα does not mean they 'spread out' or 'expanded' the flanks, i.e. caused them to occupy a longer front than before, but 'they

moved them up', i.e. made them wheel into a position at right-angles with their former front; the centre would then continue to advance in line while the flanks now marched in column. Again, in § 4 of the same chapter αἰετὸς ἐπὶ δόρατος μακροῦ ἀνατεταμένος does not mean 'a spread eagle' on a spear, nor 'an eagle spread out' (i.e. with wings extended) on a spear, but 'an eagle *lifted up*, *hoisted up*, on a spear'. Breitenbach (*Cyr.* v-viii, 3rd ed., 1878) renders αἰετὸς ἀνατ. *aquila erecta*. Similarly in *An.* 1. 10. 12, αἰετὸν τινα χρυσοῦν ἐπὶ πέλτῃ ἀνατεταμένον, ἀνατ. does not mean *spread out*, as Rehdantz and Carnuth or their reviser thought, but *hoisted up*, as Mac-michael said. In Pindar, *N.* 5. 51, ἀνὰ δ' ἰστίᾳ τείνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου, ἀνὰ . . . τείνον does not mean 'spread out', as the new L. and S. supposes. Pindar means 'hoist up the sail to the sailyard at the masthead' (see Bury's note); Myers translates 'hoist to the top-yard of the mast the sail'. Therefore all the passages cited under II should come under I.

R. L. DUNBABIN.

Hobart, Tasmania.

¹ In these passages ἀναβαίνω and ἀνατείνω are not used of upward motion in the literal sense, for it would seem that Xenophon pictured the scene of the battle as a plain, like that where the battle of Cunaxa was fought; ἀναβαίνοντα means 'going up' and ἀνατεινόμενα 'moving up' in the sense in which we speak of moving up to the front on a level floor or of a division moving up to the front on a level plain. This sense of ἀναβαίνω is not noticed in the new L. and S.

LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON DELPHIC ORACLES

THE following additions and corrections in Liddell and Scott⁹ have been suggested by a study of the vocabulary of the extant Delphic oracular responses. All the words discussed occur in hexameter verse.

1. αἰώρα. Porph. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 6. 3. 239 d (cp. 4. 12, 16). πυρσὺν αἰώραισι διπετέεσι δαμῆναι (l. 23), 'to be subdued by flashing¹ zigzags of lightning'.

¹ διπετής could, of course, be translated literally 'fallen from heaven', but Eur. *Rh.* 43 διειπετή δὲ πυρσὺν σταθμά supports the meaning attributed to it here.

L. and S. refer to the passage s.v. πυρσός, which is here used in the sense of 'a lightning flash', but s.v. αἰώρα the nearest approach to the meaning required is 'II. oscillatory movement, see-saw, pulsation', and the passages quoted in illustration are not true parallels to the usage in the oracle.

2. ἀνρίθεος. Anon. *vita Platonis* p. 9. l. 33 (D.L., ed. Westermann) (not certainly Delphic) δόξης ἀνρίθεοιο (l. 1). L. and S. give no instance of the use of ἀνρίθεος with an abstract noun in the sense of 'godlike'.

3. ἀπεναντίον. *Inscr. Magn.* 17 ἀπεναντίον Ἐνδυμίωνος (l. 4). For ἀπεναντίον with the gen. L. and S. cite only LXX, *Cant.* 6. 4, and there the meaning is 'from opposite', not, as here, 'opposite'.

4. δαφνηρεφής. Porph. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 6. 3. 239 a (cp. 1, 12, 16) δαφνηρεφών μυχάτων ἄπο (l. 4). The word is not listed in L. and S.⁹ It does appear in L. and S.³⁻⁸, though wrongly described as Sibylline.

5. εὐάρτιος. *Inscr. Magn.* 215 (cp. 6). *ἱερῇα τίθει δ' εὐάρτιον ἄγνόν* (l. 8). The word is not in L. and S. The true reading of the inscription may well be *ἱερῇα τίθει δ' εὐ ἄρτιον ἄγνόν*, though Kern chose to print *εὐάρτιον* as a single word.

6. εὐτμητος. *Inscr. Magn.* 215 (cp. 5) *νηοὺς οὐκ ᾠκίσας εὐτμήτους Διονύσω* (l. 6). 'You did not build well-hewn temples for Dionysus.' L. and S. do not cite the passage, and give no instance of *εὐτμητος* in this sense, the closest parallel being the Homeric usage with *ἱμάντες* and *τελαμών*.

7. ἥελιος. *A.P.* 14. 66 (also cited in *Ps. Plut. Vit. Hom.* p. 242 (Allen), and Oenom. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 33. 227 d) . . . *ἀμαντὰν | ἥελίων δισσῶν* (ll. 8-9). This is a reference to Homer's blindness. The metaphorical use of *ἥελιος* meaning 'eye' is not attested in L. and S.

8. θεόπροπος. Porph. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 16. 205 a *θεόπροπα θύματα* (l. 4). 'Sacrifices which were ordained by previous responses.' L. and S. do not cite this passage or give any instance of *θεόπροπος* in a passive sense.

9. καταναιετάω. Oenom. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 31. 226 b *ὅπως Κρήτην καταναιετᾶντε* (l. 3); Paus. 9. 18. 5 *Κάδμοιο πόλιν καταναιετᾶοντες* (l. 1). The word is not in L. and S. It is an easy alteration to read *Κρήτην κατά ναιετᾶντε* and *πόλιν κατά ναιετᾶοντες*; but *καταναίω* occurs sufficiently often to suggest that *καταναιετάω* may also have existed.

10. κλήζω. Porph. *Plot.* 22 *σῆσαι χορόν ἐκλήχθεν* (l. 6). L. and S. do not mention the existence of this or any other form of the aorist passive of this verb.

11. κορώνη. Paus. 9. 37. 4 (also cited in Oenom. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 30. 225 c)

ἰσοβοήη γέροντι νέην ποτίβαλλε κορώνην (l. 3). The line is quoted and explained by L. and S. s.v. *ἰσοβοεύς*, but is not mentioned s.v. *κορώνη*.

12. μύχας. Porph. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 6. 3. 239 a (cp. 1, 4, 16) *δαφνηρεφών μυχάτων ἄπο* (l. 4). L. and S. explain *μύχας* as a superlative adj., and give no instance of the neut. pl. used substantively (= *μυχός*).

13. νέως. Polyae. 6. 53 *τίπτε νέως κτίσσαι πολὺπον μινεαίνετε χώρον . . .* (l. 1). L. and S. do not attest the existence of the adverb *νέως*, though the entry s.v. *νεωστί* begins 'Adv. of νέος, for νέως'. Instead, under *ἐνεός* the adv. *ἐνεώς* is noted as a dub. l. here, but this conjecture of Reiske and Koraës is not accepted by Melber in the Teubner text.

14. πρεσβυγενής. Oenom. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 28. 223 a *πρεσβυγενέας τιμώντες* (l. 3). The word is not in L. and S., nor is it referred to under the usual form *πρεσβυγενής*. The difference in quantity confirms the existence of this variation.

15. πώτημα. Porph. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 6. 3. 239 c (cp. 1, 4, 12) *δάμνανται ζαπίροις πωτήμασι* (l. 15). L. and S. s.v. refer the reader to *πότημα*, for which the only evidence is Dindorf's emendation at Aesch. *Eum.* 250, where the MSS. give *πωτήμασι*. The occurrence of *πώτημα* here might be cited in support of Murray's return to the reading of the MSS. in his edition of Aeschylus.

16. σύνεμμι. Hdt. 7. 141. 3 *ἢ που σκιδναμένης Δημήτερος ἢ συνιούσης* (l. 12). s.v. *σκιδνημι* L. and S. quote the first half of this line and interpret it correctly as describing the scattering of seed; they have no comment, however, s.v. *σύνεμμι*, whose metaphorical use for gathering in the harvest is even bolder.

17. ὑποχείριος. D.S. 8. 29 *νίκην ὑποχείριον ἔξεις* (l. 7). L. and S. quote no instance of *ὑποχείριος* with the required sense—'which brings dominion'.

The following words which occur in oracles are cited by L. and S. as being found in prose but not in verse authors: *ἀμάντεντος* (Porph. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 16-205 a), *ἀσέβημα* (Plu. *Arat.* 53), *ἐνυγρος* (Hesych. Mil., *F.H.G.* iv. 147), *ἐπίκτητος* (Oenom. ap. Eus. *P.E.* 5. 32. 226 d),

παραιτητός (Ael. V.H. 3. 43). S.v. λογισμός L. and S. refer only to prose and comic writers, s.v. δμόνοια only to prose authors and Menander. Each word, however, occurs in an oracle; cp. for λογισμός Suid. s.v. Διογενής (= Ael. fr.

103), for δμόνοια Diod. Sic. 7. 12. 2 (also cited by Oenom. ap. Eus. P.E. 5. 28. 223 d).

H. W. PARKE.

D. E. W. WORMELL.

Trinity College, Dublin.

THE BELATED SPARTAN OCCUPATION OF DECELEA: AN EXPLANATION

THE effect of the Spartan occupation of Decelea in the closing years of the Peloponnesian War is so well known as scarcely to require any comment. Its calamitous impact on the Athenian war effort, so confidently predicted to the Spartans by the traitorous Alcibiades (Thuc. vi. 91. 7), duly came to pass; and this is not surprising in view of the strategic position occupied by the town on the borders of Attica (see L. Chandler, J.H.S. xlvii, 1926, p. 15). The considered judgement of Thucydides (vii. 27; 28; cf. viii. 69) is that King Agis' seizure of Decelea in 413 B.C. was 'one of the chief causes that brought ruin to the Athenians' cause'. Modern scholars are not disposed to quarrel with Thucydides' estimate. Indeed some of them go beyond him and, instead of calling the third and final phase of the Peloponnesian struggle the 'Ionian War' (Thucydides' own phrase, viii. 11. 3), they refer to it in the words of Isocrates and others as the 'Decelean War' (so e.g. G. B. Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of his Age, passim*).

But even though modern historians are agreed as to the fatal nature of the blow which King Agis struck at Decelea, they are not agreed on their explanations of the tardiness of the Spartan action. Why did the Spartans wait until 413 (Thuc. vii. 19), instead of occupying the strategically placed town at the war's outbreak in 431? Were the Spartans so obtuse that they failed to see the strategic advantage to be gained by seizing Decelea? Did it really need an Alcibiades to point it out to them, and even then only after the lapse of no fewer than seventeen years? The Spartans of the fifth century B.C. may not have enjoyed a high reputation for insight, wit, or

intellectual attainments, but in matters military they were certainly swift to divine advantages. They devoted most of their time and thought to tactical and strategic studies and exercises. It is incredible that they were so stupid as not to perceive from the very outset that they could strike a shrewd blow at Athens by occupying Decelea. And, just in case this thought had not occurred to them spontaneously in 431, it surely must have suggested itself after 425 when the Athenians themselves, by establishing their base at Pylos, had demonstrated the harm which an offensive strongpoint on the enemy's own territory could wreak. Even so, the Spartans still kept their hands off Decelea. Why?

Modern scholars, where they have not simply ignored the problem altogether, fail to give any very satisfactory explanation. In the early months of the war, so Prof. F. E. Adcock suggests (*Camb. Anc. Hist.* v. 211), the Spartans avoided Decelea because they were unwilling to expose their troops to possible contamination with the plague raging in Attica. But this argument is unconvincing: the Spartan forces equally ran the risk of infection by annually invading Attica. Nor can one be very much impressed by the view that the Spartans were unwilling to commit a substantial body of troops, including possibly one of the two kings, to the protracted and semi-permanent task of garrisoning a fortress in Attica. In time of war states, especially military states such as Sparta, are not guided by such limited liability considerations. After the Athenians had once demonstrated the efficacy of such a garrison at Pylos in 425, the Spartans surely might have

been expected to shed any reluctance they felt about maintaining a force indefinitely abroad.

The reason for the Spartan forbearance is undoubtedly to be found in Herodotus (ix. 73). He points out that the Spartans held Decelea in exceptional regard because of the role it was believed to have played centuries earlier in the mythological period. In prehistoric times the Deceleans, so it was alleged (λέγουσι), had helped the Tyndaridae to rescue their sister Helen when she was abducted by the Athenian, Theseus. For this reason, so Herodotus says, the Spartans ever afterwards felt grateful to Decelea and paid it exceptional honours (including ἀτελείη and προεδρίη). The truth or falsity of this legend about the Tyndaridae need not concern us. Decelea was certainly a very ancient town; its origins went back to the early beginnings of Attica (cf. Strabo ix. 1. 20, p. 397). This, of course, does not necessarily mean that the old mythological tale contained a solid kernel of historical fact. However, this is irrelevant. The important thing is not whether the old story was true, but whether the Spartans believed it to be true. Anything that a nation accepts as true must be reckoned a political fact. Actually antiquity supplies other examples of nations which granted privileges to foreign states because of some alleged or fancied service performed in a dim and remote mythological past. The Romans, for example, exempted the people of Segesta in Sicily from taxation because the latter claimed to have been founded by the Romans' own ancestor, Aeneas, during his flight from Troy to Italy (Cic. *II Verr.* iii. 13; iv. 72).

Here, then, is the reason why the Spartans in the early years of the Peloponnesian War refrained from doing the

obvious and did not seize and fortify Decelea as a *point d'appui* on Attic soil. They were reluctant to perpetrate any act of violence against a town which they believed rightly or wrongly had a claim on their gratitude. Herodotus indeed (loc. cit.) explicitly tells us that during their annual incursions into Attica in the early years of the Peloponnesian War the Spartans, deliberately and of set purpose, 'kept hands off Decelea, although they ravaged the rest of Attica'.

Incidentally this explanation also accounts for the Athenian failure to fortify Decelea. It may be that the Athenians were so wedded to the Periclean strategy of withdrawing their ground forces within the Long Walls that they would never have attempted a defence of the outlying towns in their territory anyway. But it is at least arguable that they might have placed a small nuisance garrison in Decelea, just as they did in Plataea, to deny it to the enemy for as long as possible, especially as they were very much worried by the fear that the Spartans might occupy it and convert it into a standing offensive base (Thuc. vi. 91. 6). They felt it unnecessary to do so because of the peculiar affection which, they were well aware, the Spartans felt for Decelea: they counted on Spartan abstention with some confidence. This confidence was justified until 413, when the Spartans became impatient and were determined to bring the war to an end no matter by what means. Even then the Spartans evidently still felt some compunction about meddling with Decelea. It took Alcibiades eighteen months to persuade them to forgo their scruples and seize the place.

E. T. SALMON.

McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada.

'COUNTERPOINT' IN ENGLISH AND LATIN VERSE

A. E. HOUSMAN, discoursing on *The Name and Nature of Poetry*,¹ noted with precision a fault which admirers of Robert Bridges vaguely felt in his poetry

¹ The Leslie Stephen Lecture (Cambridge, 1933), p. 8.

but could not clearly define. One of the topics which he says he would have discussed if he had taken for his theme 'The Artifice of Verse' is 'the necessary limit to inversion of stress, which Milton understood and Bridges overstepped'.

The first line of *The Testament of Beauty*, as if by way of challenge, runs: Mortal Prudence, offspring of divine Providence.

Now, the first four feet of this line, in the pronunciation of ordinary speech, are trochaic. Only the last two emerge into the iambic rhythm, which is the rhythm of the line. So we are not meant to read the line with the pronunciation of ordinary speech. We are to be aware that the metre is iambic, and, in the tension created by the opposite pull of metrical ictus and accent of everyday speech, we are to slow down the pace and lift the language to the chanting or singing level. Much is gained by this element of artifice.

It will not do for the mere layman to say just where the 'necessary limit' must be. One suspects that Bridges, with his fine ear for Classical verse and his preoccupation with syllabic quantity, rather tended to minimize the stress accent in English words. He was right, however, to dwell on the factor of quantity. It is a factor in English words. Yet a continual contradiction of the normal stress accent in a long poem is apt to tire the reader, and Housman's judgement may be allowed to stand, that Bridges 'overstepped the necessary limit'.

Milton begins *Paradise Lost*:

Of man's first disobedience and the fruit,
with only one inversion, *first dis-*, but it makes a vast difference to the line.

Mark Antony in Shakespeare apostrophizes the body of Caesar:

Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils
Shrunk to this little measure?

After the uniform, smooth iambic movement of the previous line, the monosyllable *shrunk*, with the momentary reversal of that movement, is wonderfully effective.

There is a good example in the last line of the stanza of Blake quoted by Housman (op. cit., p. 45):

Tho' thou art worshipped by the names divine
Of Jesus and Jehovah, thou art still
The Son of Morn in weary Night's decline,
The lost traveller's dream under the hill.

It would be ridiculous, of course, to forget words, picture, and context, and to

say that the inversions of the second and the fourth foot explain this line, but to them are due something at least of the emotional appeal of its 'pure and self-existent poetry'.

It was Gerard Manley Hopkins who gave currency to the term 'counterpoint' for the simultaneous presentation to consciousness of two contrasting rhythms in verse. He was himself a musician, a fact which may serve to inspire general confidence in the aptness of the transferred use of the word, and to mollify the feelings of other musicians who might be indignant at the theft or borrowing of a term from their proper vocabulary. Certainly it is an advantage to have the metrical phenomenon given a name, and a name which is associated with aesthetic appeal. Hopkins himself would not have used the term 'counterpoint' where only a single reversed stress occurred in a line, but the principle of the thing is the same and no distinction will be made here. One example from him will suffice; the second and third lines of Poem 50:¹

Why do sinners' ways prosper? and why must
Disappointment all I endeavour end?

No one reading the whole of this short poem can miss the effect of pained protest conveyed by the reversals of the iambic movement. Hopkins is a cunning craftsman, and it is a pity that at a first glance we are repelled by some risible absurdities in his verse.

In Latin verse the phenomenon of counterpoint exists and is in essentials the same. True, quantity is the basis here, but the other two factors, metrical ictus and the stress accent of ordinary speech, are strong, and in their mutual agreements and rivalries make up much of the character and music of Latin lines. It is not a question of the reversal of a *foot*, though that may come through the process of substitution. The rivalry is that between ictus and accent only. In English the stress accent is commanding and sets the rhythm always, while in cases of counterpoint the ictus beat is heard as an undertone. In Latin the position seems to be reversed.

¹ Robert Bridges, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1930).

Where there is rivalry it is ictus that takes the lead and the ear is conscious of the less dominant but yet significant accent.

If there were any doubt about the reality of stress accent in Latin, it would be dispelled by the consideration of iambic and trochaic lines from Comedy and Tragedy. It is remarkable how constant is the coincidence of accent and ictus. In fact, the best practical rule for learning the build of dramatic lines is to read words in the normal way, paying attention to accent rather than quantity. As a rule the majority of the stressed syllables will also be the points which mark the rhythm of the metre. Take the following favourable, but common enough, types:

contempla placide formam et faciem virginis
(Iamb. Senar.) Naevius, *Danae*
saepe est etiam sub palliolo sordido sapientia
(Troch. Septenar.)

Caecilius Statius, *ex incert. fab.*
sat magna usura est pro beneficio memoria
(Iamb. Senar.) Publil. Syrus, *Sent.*
o pestifera, portentifera, trux tolutiloquentia!
(Troch. Septenar.) Novius, *Gallinaria*

It might be profitable to inquire whether, apart from the inevitable clash of ictus and accent in trochaic and iambic lines, special effects were sometimes aimed at. For instance, counterpoint seems to add pathos to the appeal of Polymestor's ghost to his mother:

mater, te appello, tu qui curam somno suspensam
levas (Iamb. Octonar.) Pacuvius, *Iliona*

Te appello, mater would not be so effective. A later line in the same fragment:

neu reliquias, quaeso, meas sieris denudatis ossibus,
gives emotional force to *quaeso* from the tension of accent and ictus. Or again, a glance through the noble protest of Laberius against Caesar's act of petty revenge will suggest that feeling is heightened in certain lines by the artifice of counterpoint:

nullus timor, vis nulla, nulla auctoritas (Iamb.
Senar.)

or

hominem me denegare quis posset pati?

or

equus Romanus e Lare egressus meo.

But in a rapid summary like this, which is intended only to be suggestive, iambic and trochaic lines do not offer favourable evidence. It is quite a different matter when we turn to other metres, e.g. hexameters, hendecasyllables, and lyric stanzas. Simo in Terence's *Andria* begins a well-known iambic line (126) *hinc illae lacrumae*, accent and ictus coinciding. Horace (*Epp.* i. xix. 41) uses the same words to open a hexameter, but they have in the new setting a different tone and character. We recognize at once vast possibilities opened up for verse. Virgil is master of all the subtleties of versification. He can suggest to the unsophisticated ear a wealth of meaning, and it is better, perhaps, to share Psyche's blissful ignorance than to ask to know more. But the attempt to analyse and explain will be made. A somewhat mechanical explanation can be given of a mechanical effect aimed at in *Aen.* viii. 452:

illi inter sese multa vi brachia tollunt.

The alternate upward swing and downward stroke of two hammers at an anvil is suggested to perfection. How? There are of course the three dissyllables *inter, sese, multa*; there are the pauses of three caesurae; but the downward stroke and the force of the blow are surely suggested to the mind by the effort, so to speak, of putting the ictus on the second syllables of these three words in succession, against the natural accent of the first syllables.

There have been people, there have even been scholars, who believed that the accepted scansion of the Sapphic stanza was wrongheaded. They succeeded in making a sort of rhythm for themselves:

Pérsicos ódi púer apparátus,
displícit néxae philyra corónae,
mítte sectári rósa quo locórum
séra morétur.

They knew nothing of the pleasure of metrical counterpoint, but their scansion is just the other tune which we hear under the measured cadence of the metrical ictus.

¹ The slight, but deliberate, substitution of *multa* for *magna* of *Georg.* iv. 174 increases the effect of explosive *t*.

Whether there is a 'necessary limit' to inversion in Latin verse, for instance in the hexameter, is a curious question for the metrical expert. We might hazard a guess that Bridges modelled the six-foot line of the *Testament of Beauty*, as far as counterpoint is concerned, on the Latin hexameter.

The above observations, on the Latin

side, are intended to counter a prevalent idea that the measuring of syllables and the marking of feet are a sufficient explanation of the structure of Latin lines; and to hint to those who recognize accent that it plays a greater role than they imagine.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

-ERE AND -ERUNT IN TACITUS

'TACITUS is very fond of the perfect form in *-ere* and prefers it more and more to the popular *-erunt* as his historical style develops. In the *Agricola* the proportion is 30 to 7, in the later works about 14 to 1' (Furneaux and Anderson, *Agricola*, p. 132; compare Löfstedt, *Philolog. Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aethiopiae*, p. 38). These figures are inaccurate: more accurate ones are:

	<i>-erunt</i>	<i>-ere</i>	Proportion
<i>Germania</i>	10	8	1 : 0.8
<i>Agricola</i>	11	37	1 : 3.36
<i>Histories</i>	32	294	1 : 9.2
<i>Annals</i>	33	337	1 : 10.0

But the orderly progression which the table shows is deceptive, as is clear from the proportions in the individual books of the *Histories* and *Annals*:

Hist.	Ann.	Ann.
i. 1 : 4.2	i. 1 : 10.0	xi. 1 : 6.5
ii. 1 : 7.4	ii. 1 : 21.5	xii. 1 : 41.0
iii. 1 : 17.0	iii. 1 : 5.8	xiii. 1 : 21.0
iv-v. 1 : 14.3	iv. 1 : 34.0	xiv. 1 : 5.8
	v-vi. 1 : 5.4	xv-xvi. 1 : 8.2

A list of the instances of *-erunt* is given at the end of this note.

In view of these figures it is clear that a crude comparison of arithmetical proportions does not reveal any uniform development in usage. Is any general trend discernible? The *Dialogus* uses only the form *-erunt*: figures for *Germania* and *Agricola* are given later. In the *Histories* and *Annals* the following tendencies are to be noted.

1. According to the distinction Aorist (ἐπολιθα) : Present Perfect (πεπολιθα)¹ we find the proportions: *-ere* 20 : 1; *-erunt* 2 : 1. Moreover, of 31 examples

of *-ere* as present perfect, 22 (over 70 per cent.) are instances of three verbs of recording (*tradidere* 13, *credidere* 5, *prodidere* 4).

2. *-ere* is used medially² more often than *-erunt*.

	Medial	Final
<i>-ere</i>	3	4
<i>-erunt</i>	3	16

3. In some metrical patterns a preference is given to one or other form; the most striking instances are:

υ υ υ (e.g. <i>subiere</i>)	6.5% of all forms in <i>-ere</i>
υ υ υ (e.g. <i>subierunt</i>)	14.4% of all forms in <i>-erunt</i>
- υ υ (e.g. <i>tradidere</i>)	15.5% of all forms in <i>-ere</i>
- υ υ (e.g. <i>tradiderunt</i>)	30.4% of all forms in <i>-erunt</i>
- - υ υ (e.g. <i>descivere</i>)	26.2% of all forms in <i>-ere</i>
- - - υ (e.g. <i>desciverunt</i>)	19.2% of all forms in <i>-erunt</i>

These proportions obtain in both medial and final examples.

² I have here excluded:

1. All cases where either form stands immediately after a full stop or colon: the proportion is fairly similar, viz. *-erunt* 3/65, *-ere* 39/631. (Incidentally, though one of the three examples is *fuere qui* (*Hist.* ii. 2), Tacitus elsewhere without exception has (*de-*)*fuere qui/quos* (over 20 exx.).)

2. All cases of *-erunt* with enclitic *-que* (5 in *Histories* and *Annals*, 1 at *Agricola*, c. 6), as Tacitus never writes *-ereque*.

3. All cases where either form is followed by a comma, as editors observe no uniformity in use. (For the Oxford text the figures are:

without commas, *-ere* 1 : 1.375; *-erunt* 1 : 5.33

$$\text{Coefficient } \frac{5.33}{1.375} = 3.88$$

with commas, *-ere* 1 : 2.2; *-erunt* 1 : 8

$$\text{Coefficient } \frac{8}{2.2} = 3.64$$

¹ Haase (quoted in F. Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (3rd edition, Leipzig, 1897), iii. 193) noted this distinction in 1836, but claimed for its application too universal a validity.

4. Over and above the three preceding tendencies, there is in *Oratio Recta* an added preference for *-erunt*.

-ere (total 12, less than 2% of all examples).

Aorist	Pres. Perfect	Proportion
7	5	1.4 : 1

-erunt (total 15, over 25% of all examples).

Aorist	Pres. Perfect	Proportion
6	9	0.66 : 1

What of the *Agricola* and *Germania*? The same tendencies are considered.

	Aorist	Pres. Perfect
<i>-ere</i> { <i>Germ.</i> 3 : 1 <i>Agric.</i> 5.16 : 1		
<i>-erunt</i> { <i>Germ.</i> 0.43 : 1 <i>Agric.</i> 0.43 : 1		

Though the magnitudes are much less than in *Histories* and *Annals*, it is to be observed that the coefficient of *Histories* and *Annals* lies between that of *Germania* and *Agricola*.

$$\text{Germania} \quad \frac{3}{0.43} = 7$$

$$\text{Hist. and Annals} \quad \frac{20}{2} = 10$$

$$\text{Agricola} \quad \frac{5.16}{0.43} = 12$$

2. There is no medial example of *-erunt* in either *Germ.* or *Agric.*

	Medial	Final
<i>-ere</i> : <i>Germania</i> . . . 1 : 3		
<i>Agric.</i> . . . 1 : 1.5		
(<i>Hist. and Annals</i> 1 : 2.2)		

As the total number of examples is small, forms followed by a comma are classed as final, and the figures for *Germ.* and *Agric.* are to be compared with those in sect. 3 of note 2 on page 17. The low proportion in *Agric.* may in part be due to the fact that in this work *-ere* alone is used before a vowel, whereas in *Histories* and *Annals* *-erunt* also is used.

3. The small number of examples in *Germ.* and *Agric.* makes percentages unreliable: the actual number of examples is added in brackets.

	Germania		Agricola	
	<i>-ere</i>	<i>-erunt</i>	<i>-ere</i>	<i>-erunt</i>
— — — ▽	14 (1)	10 (1)	11 (4)	18 (2)
— — — ▽	0	40 (4)	14 (5)	18 (2)
— — — ▽	28 (2)	30 (3)	30 (11)	9 (1)

Unless it be that there is a slight tendency for the patterns in *Agricola* to approximate to those of *Histories* and *Annals*, no conclusion can be drawn.

4. For the two speeches in *Agricola* (cc. 30-2 and 33-4) the figures are:

	<i>-ere</i>		<i>-erunt</i>
Aorist	Pres. Perfect	Aorist	Pres. Perfect
3	1	0	5

Five examples of *-erunt* to 4 of *-ere* (compare the ratio of 15/12 in *Histories* and *Annals*); all examples of *-erunt* are pres. perf., all of *-ere* are aorist except c. 30 *defuere terrae*, where the verb is displaced to allow the juxtaposition of *terrae* and *mare*; as *-erunt* is never used medially in *Agricola*, *-ere* for the pres. perf. is here unavoidable.

Instances of *-erunt*

Germania

adsueverunt (4), *finierunt* (6), *prohibuerunt* (10), *defecerunt* (24), *cediderunt* (33), *nutrierunt* (36), *abstulerunt* (37), *perculerunt* (37), *insederunt* (43), *traxerunt* (46).

Agricola

interciderunt (3), *vixeruntque* (6), *habuerunt* (8), *fuerunt* (11), *effugerunt* (31), *tradiderunt* (32), *reliquerunt* (32), *cediderunt* (34), *restiterunt* (34), *adpropinquaverunt* (37), *inclaruerunt* (42).

Histories

- i. *rettulerunt* (1), *egerunt* (9), *crediderunt* (14), *depulerunt* (16), *turbaverunt* (18), *transtulerunt* (25), *perdiderunt* (37), *hauserunt* (51), *flagitaverunt* (72), *redieruntque* (82).
- ii. *fuerunt* (2), *firmaverunt* (9), *circumvenerunt* (15), *viderunt* (20), *verterunt* (38), *venerunt* (41), *attulerunt* (55), *desciverunt* (77), *habuerunt* (84), *composuerunt* (101).
- iii. *abstulerunt* (6), *subierunt* (69), *traxerunt* (71), *alueruntque* (71).
- iv. *inierunt* (38), *maluerunt* (42), *fuerunt* (42), *pertulerunt* (58), *refugerunt* (65), *provenerunt* (65), *fuerunt* (73).
- v. *instituerunt* (5).

Annals

- i. *inseruerunt* (34), *opposuerunt* (35), *venerunt* (57), *docuerunt* (66), *fecerunt* (74).
- ii. *tradiderunt* (17), *discesseruntque* (57).
- iii. *duraverunt* (16), *maluerunt* (26), *tribuerunt* (30), *arcuerunt* (42), *intulerunt* (55), *rettulerunt* (63).
- iv. *manserunt* (35).
- v. *proruperunt* (3), *effugerunt* (6).
- vi. *fuerunt* (28), *cesseruntque* (32), *acceperunt* (37).

- xi. didicerunt (14), regnaverunt (24).
 xii. abstulerunt (18).
 xiii. detulerunt (43).
 xiv. exoleverunt (21), praeduxerunt (32), fuerunt (44), tenuerunt (55).

- xv. pepererunt (20), acciderunt (38), amiserunt (46), sumpserunt (49), crediderunt (52).
 xvi. steteruntque (30).

R. H. MARTIN.

University College, Southampton.

THE DESERT PIPE-LINE IN HERODOTUS III. 9

In *The Times*, 30 May 1945, reference was made, in illustration of modern military pipe-lines, to that ascribed by Herodotus (iii. 9) to an Arabian chief. Doubt has been thrown on the story; but the project is not impossible. Any great *sheik* had hides of camel, ox, and goat in abundance; and many women accustomed to make leather tents, water-skins, and other gear. Explanations such as a leathern lining for a channel are unnecessary, and overlook the loss from evaporation, which a pipe-line precludes. The only hydraulic difficulty would be in surmounting a ridge, but the pipe-line would naturally follow the gradient of the *wadi* whence the water was derived. At a steep descent the pipe-line would be interrupted by a water-tower, like the *castella* of Roman aqueducts. Large leathern buckets with flexible nozzle are commonly used in working deep wells throughout North Africa.

A. MAUDE.
J. L. MYRES.ARISTOTLE, *TOPICA* 107^a8-10

ἐναχοῦ δὲ τὸ ποτέ, οἷον τὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἀγαθόν· ἀγαθὸν γὰρ λέγεται τὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ.

Aristotle is discussing the ambiguity of terms as revealed by the diversity of the predicates which a term may signify. He takes τὸ ἀγαθόν as an example and shows how its meaning alters in reference to different things. In each case he indicates the reference and gives the predicate or predicates signified by τὸ ἀγαθόν in such a context.

The phrase τὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἀγαθόν disturbs this sequence by begging the question and rendering the explanation ἀγαθὸν γὰρ λέγεται τὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ superfluous. Delete the second ἀγαθόν as due to dittography and alter the punctuation to read: οἷον τὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ· ἀγαθὸν γὰρ λέγεται τὸ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ. The phrase will then correspond exactly to the immediately following πολλὰκις δὲ τὸ πρὸς, οἷον ἐπὶ τοῦ μετρίου· λέγεται γὰρ καὶ τὸ μέτριον ἀγαθόν.

There is no variation in the MS. tradition, but such errors are timeless. Aristotle's secretary may have been the delinquent.

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

University of Sheffield.

PAUSANIAS VIII. 45. 1

Τεγεᾶται δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν Τεγεάτου τοῦ Λυκάονος τῆς χώρας φασὶν ἅπ' αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι μόνη τὸ ὄνομα, τοῖς δὲ ἀνθρώποις κατὰ δῆμους εἶναι τὰς ἐπικλήσεις, Γαρεδάτας καὶ Φυλακεῖς καὶ Καρυάτας τε καὶ Κορυθεῖς,

ἐπὶ τε Πρωταχίδας καὶ Οἰάτας Μανθουρεῖς τε καὶ Ἐχενήθεις· ἐπὶ δὲ Ἀφείδαντος βασιλευόντος καὶ ἐνατός σφισι δῆμος προσεγένετο Ἀφείδαντες, τῆς δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῶν πόλεως οἰκιστὴς ἐγένετο Ἄλεος.

Τεγεάτου τοῦ Musurus τεγέα τῆς MSS. ἐπικλήσεις Jacoby οἰκήσεις MSS. Φυλακεῖς Amasaes Φυλακεῖς MSS. Πρωταχίδας: Πρωταχίδαι Steph. Byz. s.v. καὶ Οἰάτας (Steph. Byz. s.v. Olos; Xenoph. *Hell.* vi. 5. 25) Buttman καὶ οἱ τὰς MSS. Ἐχενήθεις (?) Musurus ἔχενυθεις (sic) MSS.

The change of οἰκήσεις into ἐπικλήσεις is easy and hardly needs justification. It is necessary, because Pausanias is concerned with the name of ancient Tegea and its inhabitants, before the district became a town, of which the demes then became parts. If he had been concerned with the dwelling-places of the ancient inhabitants, he would have written Γαρεδάτας καὶ Φυλακεῖς, and so on. He is not here thinking of the much later συνοικισμός of c. 476 B.C.

Oxford.

F. JACOBY.

PLUTARCH, *MOR.* 520 F

Ὅσπερ γὰρ οἱ ἀετοὶ καὶ οἱ λέοντες ἐν τῷ περιπατεῖν ἀνστρέφουσιν εἰς τοὺς ὄνυχας . . .

M. Pohlenz in the Teubner edition of the *Moralia* (1929) obelizes ἀετοὶ and annotates as follows: 'ἀρκτοι Blümner Herm. LI 417, sed ursi unguibus semper solum tangunt. αἰλουροι?' The parallel passage in 966 c δὲ λέων αἰὲν βαδίζει συνεστραμμένος τοῖς ποσίν, ἐντὸς ἀποκρέπτων τοὺς ὄνυχας makes it probable that here also Plutarch intended only to mention the lion. Accordingly I read κάττοι for ἀετοὶ and delete the words οἱ κάττοι καὶ as a Byzantine interpolation. The word κάττος for the cat appears first about 900 A.D.; cf., for instance, P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, ii (1910), 352.

W. MOREL.

Heath School, Halifax.

JUVENAL V. 103-6

uos anguilla manet longae cognata colubrae
 aut glacie aspersus maculis Tiberinus et ipse
 uernula riparum pinguis torrente cloaca
 et solitus mediae cryptam penetrare Suburae.

Recent discussions agree in assuming that *glacie* is indefensible, and the word has been freely emended to provide *Tiberinus* with a nominative noun. If, indeed, the phrase can mean only that the fish had met ice in its habitat, and that this ice had made it spotty, Duff's suggestion that Juvenal 'was probably no naturalist' can hardly save the

text. There is, however, another possibility: that the *maculae* are spots of real or apparent putrefaction, which the fishmonger has tried to check or hide by the application of ice. Change *maculis* to *maculas* and this sense is obtained: the fishmonger *glacie aspersit maculas*. The name of the fish will then be *Tiberinus*, and I leave discussion of its identity to naturalists. In l. 153 we again meet food not only inferior but out of condition, *tu scabie fruoris mali*, and fish goes quickly in the South. We may remember Baedeker's sage advice (*Southern Italy*, 1903, p. xxviii): 'The traveller should adopt the Neapolitan custom of rejecting fish that are not quite fresh.'

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

QUINTILIAN XII. 10. 27-8: A POSTSCRIPT
(C.R. lvii, pp. 9-12)

WHEN I discussed this passage I was quite unaware that it was the subject of a valuable paper by Miss E. Adelaide Hahn in *Language*, xvii, 1941, pp. 24-32, which the black-out of war prevented me from discovering until January of this year (1946). I differ from Miss Hahn in two points only. Her suggestion that by *zopyris* in §28 Quintilian is transliterating *ζώμυρα*, 'sparks', seems improbable—why should such a word ever have been transliterated? On the other hand, *zopyron* and

Zopyrus do occur as actual transliterations. Secondly, a much more important point, she has made too hasty a conclusion in assuming that the second of the two *litterae tristes et horridae quibus Graecia caret* is consonantal *u*: she wrongly correlates (though with some doubt) the *nam et illa* of §29 with *Aeolicae quoque litterae* below, not realizing that the true correlation is with *duras et illa* of §30, and that the letter in question is consequently *q* (as, indeed, Quintilian's remarks there plainly show). The point about digamma is purely parenthetic, and in any case it is unlikely that Quintilian would have taken as one of his two nasty-sounding Latin letters lacking to Greek a sound which has no separate character in Latin (apart from Claudius' short-lived invention) and is technically present in some Greek, in spite of its disappearance from Attic.

Apart from these points we agree consistently: our treatment, argument, and main conclusions are virtually identical, so much so that I feel it necessary to make it clear that my own article was written quite independently: I should not like American (or other) scholars to think that I had drawn upon Miss Hahn's paper without acknowledgement. The coincidence is all the more extraordinary in that this passage of Quintilian has never been thoroughly discussed before.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University College, Cardiff.

REVIEWS

THE ELUSIVE SOPHOCLES

C. M. BOWRA: *Sophoclean Tragedy*. Pp. vi+384. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944. Cloth, 20s. net.

SOPHOCLES is one of those poets who are very different things to different readers. He is, by turns, the serene artist, the supreme technician, the sad, ironic poet of humanity, the interpreter, or the critic, of Periclean ideas and ideals. Moreover, nearly every surviving play, either in part or as a whole, is given very different interpretations. This is a challenge, and Dr. Bowra has taken it up, arming himself with the modern weapon of the historical method of criticism. This is an excellent weapon, if you are aware of its dangers (for there are critics who have only killed themselves with it, though some have succeeded in killing their author too¹);

Dr. Bowra wields it with confidence, trying, so far as it is possible, to see Sophocles through contemporary eyes. The result is a picture of Sophocles which contains much that is new, much that is true, and much that is a very salutary corrective of the 'pure artist' theory. The present reviewer is far from believing all that Dr. Bowra says, but more than once Dr. Bowra has caused him to send for sackcloth and ashes: and that (upon mature reflection) is a thing to be grateful for.

His clear perception of the fundamental earnestness of Sophocles has led Dr. Bowra to more than one masterly piece of interpretation, and to many more which are, at least, very stimulating and suggestive. Among these may be mentioned the treatment of the *δαίμων* in the *O.T.*, and of Oedipus' self-blinding, the whole (or nearly the whole)

¹ This is no place for an essay on The Historical Method of Criticism. Its chief limitation is that it does not exist: there exists only Criticism. What is called The Historical Method of Criticism is ancillary to Criticism, supplying it with facts of a

certain kind. It is then for criticism to decide which of them are relevant, and what they mean.—All this has very little to do with Dr. Bowra's book.

of t
trea
seen
Bow
Sop
leng
and
spoi
by
refu
D
may
as t
flict
livin
set
but
mus
limi
will
are
the
feren
the
worl
sing
Th
well
poss
Sop
situa
did
with
pene
his p
fore
whic
and
whol
comp
Th
displ
hous
'tha
said
hasn
may
desig
did;
in go
tion
every
whol
one
Soph

of the chapter on the *O.C.*, and the treatment of the *Ajax*—though there seems to be at least one difficulty in Dr. Bowra's interpretation of the *Ajax*: if Sophocles' design was to show how at length Ajax makes his peace with gods and with men, why did he unnecessarily spoil this closing harmony, as he does, by making Odysseus ask for, and be refused, a share in the burial rites?

Dr. Bowra's conception of Sophocles may be summarized in some such way as this: his tragedy turns on the conflict between gods and men; men, living in a world of illusion and error, set their wills against the divine will, but the divine will must prevail: men must learn, and accept, their mortal limitations; those who oppose the divine will come to grief, and, in grief, they are reconciled to it. Thus Sophocles is the successor of Aeschylus, the great difference being that in Aeschylus we see the effect of the tragic conflict on the world, in Sophocles its effect on the single soul.

This thesis is strenuously argued and well supported; it should make it impossible for anyone to write again of Sophocles as the amateur of dramatic situations, plots, and characters, who did not concern himself very seriously with the moral problems that he happened to come across in the course of his play-making. Dr. Bowra brings before us one aspect of this complex poet which has too often been overlooked, and that is a great service. But is it the whole poet? Is the picture substantially complete?

There was once a very rich man, who displayed to a friend his nearly finished house. 'I must say', said the friend, 'that it looks damnably ugly.' 'Ah!' said the rich man, 'but the architecture hasn't been put on yet.' Sophocles, we may safely assume, did not think of design and decoration as this rich man did; we may assume that he knew how, in good design, elevation and decoration are—like the ground-plan and everything else—parts of a logical whole, all of them different aspects of one idea. If we can assume this of Sophocles, then we can say that the

reasonably complete conception of the poet's tragic idea will explain, as nothing else will, his tragic architecture—both the ground-plan of a play, and its elevations and its decoration. The whole thing should be a logical unity, 'as a reasonable man would define it'. Let us, then, take Dr. Bowra's interpretation of the *Philoctetes*.

The *Philoctetes*, like the other plays, shows the struggle between the will of men and the will of the gods. The gods have a grand plan: Troy is to be captured in a certain manner, and Philoctetes, who is suffering for trespass on holy soil, is to be recompensed with health and glory. But this plan is opposed, or obstructed—for different reasons—by Odysseus and by Philoctetes himself: Odysseus thinks to emend the oracle by ensnaring, not persuading, Philoctetes; and Philoctetes, out of his anger against the Greek leaders, makes an 'illegitimate refusal to accept what the gods give him'. But human obstruction is swept aside, and through the intervention of Heracles the will of Heaven is enforced.

We may object: if this is what Sophocles meant, he left it a little obscure, for what catches the attention is not a theological doctrine, but a very clear and absorbing conflict of persons and principles. But Dr. Bowra is ready for us; ἀπορος ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἐρχεται. 'The characters . . . move in a mist of illusions and mistakes, and the play conveys this atmosphere by concealing at the start what its structure and central ideas are. In its excited personal issues we may easily miss the divine plan. . . . It comes out gradually, and just when the whole situation seems hopelessly muddled, he begins to make the main plan clear. This is his way of emphasizing the darkness in which men live and move' (p. 264). Not 'darkness visible', but darkness very nearly invisible. Why did Sophocles not restrain for once his ruling passion for excited personal issues?

If, further, we object that the more Neoptolemus opposes the divine plan, by consenting to carry Philoctetes to Greece instead of to Troy, the more we

admire him, Dr. Bowra has anticipated us: 'The play, we might think, enlists our dislike of those who do what the gods command and our liking for those who oppose it. The *Philoctetes* certainly produces this effect on most readers, and when it was first performed it must have had a similar effect on an Athenian audience.' Why, then, did not Sophocles think out a less misleading way of saying what he wanted to say?

Other objections follow thick and fast. At v. 676 begins the only stasimon in the play. The stage is empty—an excellent opportunity for Sophocles to hint at his real meaning, to make the chorus reflect, for example, on the ill-success of those who try to be too clever. But the precious opportunity is wasted: the chorus, like everybody else, does its level best to concentrate our attention on those personal issues.

Again, from v. 915 onwards we are to find Philoctetes, too, guilty of obstructing the gods' plan. But Philoctetes does not yet know what it is! He has been told (vv. 611 ff.) that the Greeks will not take Troy unless they persuade him to help them—and that is no 'plan'; and now, at vv. 915 ff., Neoptolemus says, very baldly, 'You have to go'—*δεῖ γάρ, πολλή κρατεῖ ἀνάγκη*—and 'My proposal is to save you from *κακοῦ τοῦδε* (from all this? or, from this malady of yours?) and to capture Troy with you'; and surely we cannot reasonably condemn Philoctetes if, in the moment of being betrayed, he refuses to be impressed by statements of this kind. In vv. 1314 ff. Neoptolemus, having received no further information from without, comes clean; why not at v. 915? So one could continue for quite a long time.

There are, indeed, difficulties in the structure of the *Philoctetes* (too complex to be discussed here), but the theory of the conflict between two worlds makes them worse rather than better. It fails to explain the ground plan.

Dr. Bowra gives us one aspect of Sophocles' mind, possibly the most important one: but is it all? Is Sophocles so eminently doctrinal? 'It is the gods who make Ajax mad, who ordain his hideous end for Heracles, who punish

Creon, who arrange the whole career of Oedipus, who send Orestes to kill his mother, who decide that Philoctetes shall take Troy, who turn old Oedipus into a demonic being. When they are at work, the whole setting is different from Shakespeare's. It is in some sense theological, and if the gods act in this or that way, we ask why they do it and what it means. We can hardly do otherwise, and Sophocles demands such questions from us: for he has his answers to them' (p. 13).

The setting is different from Shakespeare's—but Dr. Bowra's treatment entirely omits what is Shakespearian in Sophocles, namely the vividly drawn minor characters and the sharp contrasts between dramatic planes—the cheerful, hopeful messenger before the doomed Oedipus; the Watchman, half-glad, half-sorry, that he has found the criminal. (The two shepherds in the *O.T.* may have little to do with the theological scheme, but surely they have a lot to do with Sophocles' picture of life, which is what we really want to find.) The contrast with Shakespeare is striking, though not complete; the contrast with Aeschylus and Euripides is much more so, considering that all three were of the same city and the same century. When the gods are at work in the other two tragedians they work indeed: Aeschylus' Zeus freezes a river to punish one army and raises a storm to punish another: and we know how Euripides presents the activities of Artemis and Aphrodite, of Athena and Poseidon, of Dionysus. Why do they work so differently in Sophocles? Why, in Sophocles, are human relations and contingencies so prominent: why are the gods often so mysteriously kept in the background? 'They arrange the whole career of Oedipus.' Do they? They foresee and they foretell, but do they ever intervene? Twice 'an effort is made to avoid what has been foretold, and both efforts are frustrated'. But how? By the gods? When Laius and Iocasta shrink from killing the child; when the shepherds, because they happen to be men of pity and not callous brutes, spare its life; when Polybus, being childless, adopts

the
willi
thin
pow
mou
thes
conf
is he
Shal
mys
The
all—
wou
Aesc
cles
that
subn
in th
me t
his
Elec
theo
the g
Creo
hang
herse
ished
this.
after
bilty
reflec
to th
βροτ
thing

Alexa
So
Tr
M
lig
Sci
194
THIS
than
tradi
1943,
list o
there
cles,
filled.
a cat
rate,
scholi

the child from the Corinthian—a man willing, now as later, to invest something in the gratitude of the rich and powerful; when a tipsy man opens his mouth too wide—are the gods directing these people? In all this is Sophocles confidently telling us about the gods, or is he, in a much less Miltonic but more Shakespearian way, contemplating the mysterious thing that we call life? The gods are a great part of it, but not all—or this rich Sophoclean texture would be meaningless. The religious Aeschylus avoided it; why did Sophocles develop it? Then, the decision that Philoctetes shall take Troy is, I submit, by no means the chief interest in the *Philoctetes*. Dr. Bowra persuades me that the gods do send Orestes to kill his mother—but the play is about Electra, a tragic situation rather than a theological problem. In the *Antigone* the gods do, indeed, send omens to warn Creon, but they do not make Antigone hang herself; and if she had not hanged herself, Creon would not have been punished. Aeschylus never thought like this. The chorus in the *O.T.* reflects, after the fall of Oedipus, on the instability of human happiness, but these reflections are not made part of a hymn to the gods; the keynote is *ὡς γινεαὶ βροτῶν*, pity for humanity. In these things there is something that goes be-

yond theology, and beyond (I think) what Sophocles would profess to explain.

Dr. Bowra says in the preface that he has deliberately laid emphasis on the ideas rather than on the poetry and the dramatic interest 'because the formative thought of Sophocles has been too long neglected, as his style and dramatic effects have not'. But surely this cannot be done. True, the style and dramatic effects have often been studied without reference to the thought which they were designed to embody—hence the quality of such studies. But conversely, how can we study the 'formative ideas', and how can we be sure that we have got them, unless we constantly correlate these formative ideas with the plays that they form?

Dr. Bowra is just as stimulating when he is wrong as when he is right, and I hope I have not responded too much, and too enthusiastically, to the one part of his stimulus. This is a study which no one can read without enlarging and (I speak for myself) correcting his idea of Sophocles. Nevertheless, there is still room for a study which, by making a reasonably complete synthesis of the matter and the form of the plays, will give a fuller and a more secure explanation of both.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Bristol.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF SOPHOCLES

Alexander TURYN: *The Manuscripts of Sophocles*. Pp. 41. Offprint from *Traditio, Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion*, II. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., Inc., 1944.

THIS useful work is much less ambitious than Turyn's study of the manuscript tradition of Aeschylus (see *C.R.* lvii, 1943, 109). For Aeschylus Weir Smyth's list of manuscripts was available, but there was nothing comparable for Sophocles, and it is this gap that Turyn has filled. The bulk of the paper consists of a catalogue, admirably full and accurate, of all the manuscripts of text or scholia known to him (about a hundred),

excluding only papyri, codices later than the sixteenth century, and gnomological collections (and even of these he lists, in footnotes, a considerable number). He also discusses the recorded manuscripts now untraceable. The catalogue is arranged in alphabetical order of towns, and each description, so far as possible, follows the plan: 'call number, source of information, approximate or precise date, writing material, size of a page, number of folios, number of Sophocles' lines to a page (if constant); the place and contents of the Sophoclean portion, or the place of the *Vita* (= Life of Sophocles), if any, and of each play in the MS.; presence of arguments, if any, of scholia, if any, and

definition of their character if possible on the basis of the information available; symbols used for the MS. in important editions.' Owing to war conditions Turyn has been forced to rely almost entirely on printed sources, and the catalogue will have to be revised later.

The first half-dozen pages explain his general view of the textual tradition, and the lines on which he hopes to proceed when photographic material is again available. His aim is first to eliminate apographa, and then to divide the residue into *veteres* and interpolated Byzantine, making full use, as in his earlier work, of the scholia as a guide to

the character of the text. He also hopes to sort out the Byzantine group between Thomas, Moschopolus, and Triclinius, and he gives much interesting information about this problem.

Very little has yet been done to clear up the Sophoclean tradition, and it is most desirable that Turyn should be able to carry his work through. He names half a dozen little-known *veteres* as likely to prove valuable supplements to L and A, and expects this list to grow a good deal larger in the course of his investigations.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

A NEW TEXT OF PINDAR

Pindari *Epinicia* edidit Alexander TURYN, Universitatis Varsoviensis professor. Pp. xiv+224. New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences, 1944. Cloth, \$5.

THIS edition, set in type at Cracow in 1939 and now reproduced photographically from a surviving copy, contains mainly (1) a fair survey of the quotations from Pindar in antiquity and the middle ages, the first ever published, (2) accurate collations of those MSS. which the editor thinks necessary for the constitution of the text, among them three (Athous Iber. 161, Vatican gr. 41 and 902) never used before, and (3) a text based on an independent *recensio* and *examinatio*, and, in some passages, improving upon most or all earlier editions. This is no mean achievement even if the editor's 'stemmatical' principles are not unexceptionable, and the apparatus is overburdened with orthographical, dialectical, and bibliographical futilities and with such *lectiones singulares* as ought to be eliminated.

Of Professor Turyn's new readings I recommend *Pyth.* 7. 20 (21 Schr.) κ' ἀνδρὶ instead of κεν ἀνδρὶ of the MSS., and *Nem.* 7. 85 (86 Schr.) ἐμμεν instead of Jurenka's ἔμεν (-α μὲν MSS.). The first improves the metre, the second the dialect, supporting at the same time the long neglected καὶ in l. 65. In *Ol.* 9. 57 (54 Schr.) Professor Turyn's ἦσαν (ἐσαν

the archetype), perhaps already in some MSS. (see Schr. ed. mai.), seems inevitable because of the metre, though the form recurs in one mutilated passage only, *Nem.* 9. 17.

Of unconvincing innovations I mention *Nem.* 3. 76 (79) Αἰολίσσων ἐμπνοαῖσιν and *Ol.* 10. 53 (51) νόνημνον (neutrum pro adverbio). I do not repeat what I have said against some of Professor Turyn's readings in *Gnomon* ix (1933), 166 ff., and *Philol.* xc (1935), 240; in two important passages he returns now to what I think common-sense demands.

In the parts of the book which I have checked I have found remarkably few misprints, misquotations, and inconsistencies. In the *Testimonia* for *Ol.* 1. 52 ἀφίσταμαι 'Suidas' should be 'Damascius apud Suidam', to those for *Nem.* 4. 4 add Plut. *Mor.* 467 d. In the notes on *Pyth.* 4. 102 there is Χίρων instead of Χίρωνος; but the reading is one of the many which ought not to be mentioned at all in the apparatus criticus. ρ making position at the beginning of a word is thrice called '*prosodia notabilis*' (*Nem.* 5. 13, 50; 8. 29), but left unmarked in *Pyth.* 1. 45. The phenomenon is too frequent to need notes, but scanning in lyrics would be helped by printing ῥ- or ρῥ-. e.g. ἀπὸ ρῥύτρηπος (= υ-υ-υ-) as some MSS. write.

P. MAAS.

Oxford.

MENANDER TRANSLATED

The Arbitration. The *Epileptontes* of Menander translated and completed by Gilbert MURRAY. Pp. 125. London: Allen & Unwin, 1945. Cloth, 5s. net.

PROFESSOR MURRAY, ever resourceful, has followed his *Perikeiromene* with a translation of *Epileptontes*, in the same manner and by the same method of filling the gaps in our papyrus remains. This is a bold and laudable thing to do, though Murray's restorations do not always fit the gaps, the lengths of which in *Epileptontes* are now fairly well established. (At least he does not say that he differs from the current opinion about them.) He tells us that he found it much harder than in *Perikeiromene* 'to conjecture the rest of the plot with any approach to confidence', which is understandable, for, while the main outline of the story is more certain, the comedy is so much more subtle and there is more play of character and therefore more room for conjecture about it. Some of the restoration is ingeniously done (there is an amusing little scene at the end of Act III, for which perhaps there is just room), but most of it I do not find convincing. For example, he makes Chairestratos a good and kind young man, who is genuinely in love with Habrotonon—the scene between them in Act V is much too long for the gap—and marries her in the end. This last is made possible (for we are not allowed to forget that the scene is fourth-century Athens with its queer ways) because Habrotonon is discovered to be Smikrines' other daughter lost in infancy, and another recognition scene of some length is added to close the play. To this end, again, we are told that 'she had learned enough of the impudence and cynicism of her trade, to be able to use them where necessary, but essentially her feelings . . . are those of a free woman, womanly, self-respecting and generous . . . The real slave, Onesimus, is incapable of understanding her'; and in the restored scene between her and Chairestratos we have:

H. What a slave I should have been
And worse, if I had tried to hide the truths?

Ch. I never knew a slave before who felt
In that way.

This shows a sad lack of understanding both of Menander and of human nature.

Smikrines is also softened: he will not believe all the stories about Charisios' dissipation. For example:

I hate this gossip. I believe they want
To make a fool of me. 'Never at home;
Drunken; extravagant'; I don't believe it.
The city is humming with that sort of scandal.

I cannot believe that that is a correct restoration of:

ἐξη
ἄσως[ος] ἡ πόλις
ὅλη γὰρ ᾄδει τὸ κακόν.

Murray accepts Robertson's view that the speech preserved on the *Pap. Didotiana* is from *Epileptontes*, and inserts it at the beginning of Act. IV, not later where Jensen and Körte place the big gap of 90 verses. This makes it a little easier to ignore the difficulties, for Smikrines' references to the unfaithfulness and extravagance of Charisios then come after this speech by Pamphile. But I am not persuaded: Charisios is not said by Smikrines to have become a pauper (very much the reverse) and he is said to have a mistress (and to have a son by her, in Murray's restoration); could Pamphile have said:

εἰ δ' εἰς ἔμ' ἡμάρτηκεν, αἰσέσθαι μ' ἔδει,

and

γένονεν ἐκείνος εἰς ἔμ' οἷον ἡμίον
ἐμοί τ' ἀρέσκει πάνθ' ἃ κακύνω, πάτερ.
ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐμοί μὲν χρηστός, ἡ πόρνηκε δέ· κ.τ.λ.?

Murray makes Pamphile say later in the scene:

He has never been

Unkind to me before. Something has changed him
In these last weeks. It may be I've displeased him
In some way I don't know.

She was hiding the truth from her father; but she was not so disingenuous as this.

We are disturbed in the course of

reading this translation by allusions to the Year Baby and to curious details of Attic law (doubtfully true, incidentally) and Attic custom, the kind of thing that needs a learned note. They are all, I think, in the restored parts, Murray not Menander. Here is one of them:

CHARISIUS gives money and exit to House B.
The Duenna takes the money and puts it in her mouth.

Thirty-six drachmae!

For the translation, to my ear Murray is still, as in *Perikeiromene*, too monotonous; the rhetoric of Syriskos is not distinguished from Daos' speech; when he introduces variety, it is often to bring in a quite unsuitable slang: *τί σύνους, φησί, Δᾶος*; 'Why so glum,' he said. 'What's wrong, mate?' *καὶ μάλα* (l. 303 K), *Says you!* *ὡς ἀναδῆς ἦσθα καὶ ἰταμός τις*, *How cruel you were to me!* *Ἄ cave-man!* *ὑπομαίνεθ' οὗτος*, *He's dotty!* (Akin to this is a lapse which I should never have expected in Murray: at the end of this speech he makes Onesimos escape by climbing a tree on the stage; at the end of Charisios' great speech that

follows, he makes him fall out of it with a crash. Surely not Menander's way.)

O blessed Goddess,
Persuasion, hear me! Teach me now to tell
My story right, and may the end be well!

That is excellent. But:

By Jove, she has initiative, that girl!

for *τοπαστικὸν τὸ γύναιον* is 'sad stuff'. The fact is, we have no tradition in English poetry corresponding to the easy, colloquial, yet cultured verse of Menander. The nearest thing to it, I think, is Shakespeare's prose, and perhaps Goldsmith's; and Shakespeare's mixture of verse and prose, in *Hamlet* for example, is often like the variety of elevated and colloquial styles in Menander. It is true that such a mixture is foreign to the Greek tradition; but that is because Menander had no need of it, and Greek prose has a different tempo from Shakespeare's. I should like to see the experiment tried; the *Epitrepontes* in particular is a play whose variety of tone might well be rendered in this way.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

ALEXANDRIAN POETRY

K. A. Τρυπάνης: *Ἡ Ἀλεξανδρινὴ Ποίηση. Τόμος Α'.* Pp. 235. Athens: Ἐκδοτικὸς Οἶκος Ἀνατολή Μ. Γαρνέβλη, 1943. Paper.

THIS first instalment of Professor Trypanis's study of Alexandrian Poetry is divided into five chapters, viz. (1) an introduction to the character of Alexandrian Poetry; (2) a general characterization of that poetry; (3) Alexandrian Elegy before Callimachus; (4) Callimachus; (5) the Alexandrian Epigram. It is written in 'demotic', and though the author in his preface modestly expresses his fear that the result of his attempt to write a language that should be more alive than the *katharevousa* is not altogether satisfactory, the present reviewer at least found the book agreeable to read and eminently lucid.

Professor Trypanis has studied the Alexandrians with care and controlled affection and he is extremely well read in the learned literature which has accumulated around them in such bulk as

almost to obscure the λεπταὶ ῥήσεις of the poets themselves. He writes with good sense and some independence of judgement and has produced a book which forms a capital introduction to the subject for Modern Greek students of the Classics and may certainly be recommended to scholars of other nations. Chap. 1 stresses the influence of the Sophists, Euripides, and Antimachus on the Alexandrians, claiming that with his special cultivation of the erotic and romantic element Euripides is the real father of Alexandrian Poetry. Other Euripidean traits in that poetry are said to be aetiology, narrative in oracle-form, description of works of art, etc. The influence of Antimachus is treated rather superficially, but a study of the contribution of Aristotle and his followers to the formation of Alexandrian poetic theory is interesting. The chapter concludes with an excellent sketch of the political and social environment. Chap. 2 analyses the basic ideas of Alexandrian

Poetry, particularly its struggle to shake off the dead weight of the classical tradition, which, since original genius was lacking, expressed itself by a mingling and modification of the familiar forms. The influence of Hesiod rather than Homer, of Ionia rather than Athens, is rightly stressed and more might have been said about the Ionian connexions of the earliest Alexandrians. Chap. 3 is the least interesting in the book, but this is hardly the author's fault. Unless the papyri come to our rescue, it will always be difficult to make much of Philetas, Hermesianax, and the rest. The problem of Alexandrian 'subjective' elegy is stated, but the author does not cite the latest work on the subject, A. A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy* (Blackwell, 1938). He believes that Philetas wrote a *Bittis*, and suggests that both the *Leontion* of Hermesianax and the *Apollo* of Alexander Aetolus ended in subjective love-poetry, which seems improbable. Chap. 4 is the most valuable part of the book. In view of the constant additions and scattered sources it has long been difficult to keep pace with the progress of Callimachean studies and a (comparatively)

up-to-date account like the present is very welcome. Professor Trypanis, of course, owes much to Pfeiffer, Cahen, and the two masterly articles of Herter (Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. v, 1931, pp. 387 ff.; Bursian, 1937, pp. 65-217), but he does not hesitate to disagree on occasion. The problems are clearly presented and the reader is given a detailed and attractive account of all the more important products of Callimachus' versatile genius, so far that is as they have been made public up to the present. For the rest, to quote the author, ὅλοι περιμένουμε τὴν editio maior πού ἐξάγειλε ὁ R. Pfeiffer. Chap. 5 naturally treads a more beaten track, but the general remarks on the Epigram and the treatment of the individual poets are both well worth reading.

The book contains numerous translations from the poets under review into various forms of Modern Greek verse. Some, especially those from the *Anthology*, are by O. Elytis, but most are by the author himself. Written in a more colourful demotic than the rest of the book they form an attractive feature.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

A COMMENTARY ON THUCYDIDES

A. W. GOMME: *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. I: Introduction and Commentary on Book I. Pp. xi + 479. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945. Cloth, 20s. net.

THIS is the first of three volumes in a work which, when completed, should contain about twice as much letterpress as its predecessor, How and Wells's *Commentary on Herodotus*. It lacks the usual introductory chapters on the life of the historian, on the genesis and the value of his writings: these subjects will be discussed, if at all, in a later volume. On the other hand, the notes to Thucydides' text are remarkably full and comprehensive, and are based on a thoroughgoing study of the literature on Thucydides and his times down to the end of 1943. This vast material is handled by Gomme with critical independence of judgement and sturdy

common sense. *Honoris causa*, we would single out his chronological and geographical notes, his copious use of archaeological material, his clear statement of questions that still await solution, and, above all, his expert handling of that thorniest of problems, the growth of the Athenian Empire. His notes do not always make easy reading: some are of almost alarming length, others suffer from a Thucydidean compression of language. But beyond question Gomme's *Commentary* will be indispensable for every advanced student of Thucydides.

The Introduction to this volume contains a composite chapter on 'What Thucydides took for granted', and a survey of the other ancient sources. The latter is mostly taken up with a judicious but necessarily somewhat negative chapter on Plutarch. The evidence from

coin hoards, the importance of which Gomme clearly realizes, has, unbeknown to him, been well mustered by Heichelheim in *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress 1936* (1938), pp. 68 ff.

In the chapter on Thucydides' omissions Gomme shows up some of the less well understood features in the historian's background. In exhibiting the chaotic character of Greek systems of dating he defends the chronology of Thucydides, which, he well argues, was more supple and adequate than modern critics have allowed. (He admits, of course, that for the Pentecontaetia Thucydides' dating is lamentably inadequate.) He also insists, quite rightly, that Thucydides was not blind to economic factors, but lets him off rather lightly for some of his economic reticences. True, he censures the historian for his inadequate references to war finance after 431 B.C.; but other economic questions which Thucydides disregards press themselves upon us, and might after all not have found a ready answer among his ancient readers.—How did Pericles provide for the refugees from Attica? How did the Athenians safeguard their corn supplies? Was the *σφόδρον μῖσος* (ciii. 4) which Corinth felt for Athens solely due to bickerings on the Megarian border? And is it wholly without political significance that Attic pottery and Athenian coinage were (on the unequivocal evidence of the archaeological material) displacing the Corinthian products in the western markets? And what new trade did the Athenians hope to pick up in Sicily in 415 B.C.?

Gomme further contributes some illuminating remarks on Greek warfare. Though the value of light-armed troops in such a difficult country as Greece might seem as obvious to ancients as to moderns (Gomme illustrates it from Demosthenes' Aetolian campaign, though Aetolia is by no means all mountainous, as he states), they scarcely figure in Thucydides. Gomme's explanation that light-armed troops, to be effective, must be well trained, indeed more so than hoplites, and that Greek military training was deficient all round, no doubt

hits the mark. The weakness of Greek siegecraft, for which he gives no compelling reason, may be derived from the fact that until the cannon-ball discounted the force of gravity the defenders' advantage of higher ground remained the decisive factor. As might be assumed from his previous article in *JHS* 1933, Gomme writes with full understanding of naval problems.

Of the many points of detail on which Gomme's notes invite comment, only a few can receive notice here.

9. 4. (Homer and Mycenae.)—Gomme sees a difficulty in the fact that Homer's Troy (the Troy VIIa of archaeologists) synchronizes with a degenerate Mycenae. But, as Horace observed, a *vates sacer* need not take the greatest hero for his subject; and, as Thucydides pointed out, he may create an illusion of exaggerated grandeur: the poet's Glorious Armada may in fact have been on a reduced scale and none too well equipped.

12. 3. (The Dorian Invasion.)—Gomme rightly points out, against Beloch and De Sanctis, that the archaeological evidence for this catastrophe is overwhelmingly strong. The trail of destruction, however, did not spread over all Greece: archaeologists confirm the ancient tradition that Attica was spared.

13. 3. (The first trireme, c. 700 B.C.)—This date might have been derived from a dedication recorded in a Samian temple chronicle. (Cf. the entries in the chronicle of Athena Lindia.)

18. 2. (The date of Marathon.)—The traditional date is here ably vindicated against Munro's 491.

Pp. 198–9. (The treaty between Athens and Acarnania.)—Wade-Gery's date for this (spring, 432) seems preferable to a date before 435: else it would surely have been mentioned in the Corintho-Corcyraean debate.

57. 1. τὰ τέλη τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.—These require definition.

P. 222.—Gomme sees no connexion between the unrest in Chalcidice and the foundation of Amphipolis. Since Amphipolis was rich in timber as well as in minerals, it may have disturbed the Chalcidian lumber trade.

67. 3.—Here we meet again the *communis opinio* that the Spartan Apella was limited to men above 30. This view rests on nothing more than a hasty reading of Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, xxv. 1. We may safely follow Busolt (*Staatskunde*, p. 691 and n. 3) in lowering the age of admission to 20.

77. 1. (Civil jurisdiction in the Athenian Empire.)—The conclusions reached in a long and careful note have been substantially confirmed in a recent article by R. J. Hopper (*JHS*, vol. lxiii, pp. 35 ff.).

63. 2. *ἔστιν ὁ πόλεμος οὐχ ὀπλων τὸ πλεον ἀλλὰ δαπάνης*.—According to Plutarch (*Cyassus*, ii. 8) Archidamus expressed himself more picturesquely: *ὁ πόλεμος οὐ τεταγμένα σιτεῖται*.

89–90. (Reconstruction of the Athenian city-wall.)—Gomme effectively defends against Beloch and von Stern the story of the attempted Spartan intervention. But he does not animadvert on the still more radical view, put forward by Dörpfeld (*Festschrift Judeich*, pp. 3 ff.) and (more cautiously) by von Gerkan (*Griechische Städteanlagen*, pp. 23–4), that Athens possessed no city wall before the Persian Wars.

Pp. 277–8. (The tribute of the Delian Confederates.)—Gomme makes a capital

point in suggesting that payments of tribute were sometimes made directly to Athenian strategi in the field, in which case they might not figure at all in the accounts of the Hellenotamiae. If this is correct, the bottom will have been knocked out of some recent calculations of the allies' tribute. During the Peloponnesian War the Treasurer of Athena sometimes bypassed the Hellenotamiae in this fashion (Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 75, *passim*), and the allies made a direct payment to the strategi (*ibid.* 82, ll. 34–5).

100. 2. (*Drabescus*.)—This name probably survives in Zdravik, 8 miles N. of Amphipolis (Casson, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria*, p. 68.).

112. 3. (Fifth-century Naucratis.)—Eight out of nine coins found in the fifth-century remains were Athenian (Petrie-Gardner, *Naucratis*, i, pp. 63–6).

P. 383 and n. 3. (Date of the original decree standardizing coinage in the Athenian Empire.)—This ordinance may be related to a decree, probably of 448 B.C., prescribing a more regular method of collecting tribute (B. H. Hill and B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, 1944, pp. 1 ff.).

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE PHILEBUS

R. HACKFORTH. *Plato's Examination of Pleasure*. A Translation of the *Philebus*, with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. vi+143. Cambridge: University Press, 1945. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

A COMPARISON with other English translations will quickly reveal that Professor Hackforth's is the most accurate and discerning which has yet appeared. The commentary, distributed among the translation after the method of the late Professor Cornford, exhibits in a masterly way the strength and weakness of the dialogue and its relation to the other works of Plato. H. tentatively places *Phil.* after *Polit.* and before *Tim.* in the period 360–354; it was meant as a comment on Eudoxus' equation of pleasure and good; but Eudoxus can-

not, he thinks, be identified with Philebus. Except for one passage (53 c–55 d), which is 'not an integral part of the work', H. takes a more favourable view than previous commentators of the structure of the dialogue.

The *Philebus* is one of the less helpful works of Plato. Its psychology of feeling is defective, and full of concepts hard to defend, such as pleasures which are 'false' ('false' sometimes meaning 'mistaken' and sometimes 'non-existent') or 'mixed' (with pain). Its ethical judgements are often, if not arbitrary, purely derivative, depending on a doctrine of virtue and happiness which is neither stated nor clearly implied. Some passages (11 d, 22 d–e, 33 b) suggest the sharp Platonic distinction between pleasure and happiness; others (22 a,

etc.) appear to assume that human happiness requires pleasure as an essential constituent, and this in spite of the fact that pleasure has nothing to do with the measure and proportion which make life 'good' and, presumably, happy. The division of 'all existing things' into four classes (Limit, Unlimited, Mixture, Cause of the Mixture) is notoriously fertile in perplexities. Intelligence belongs to Cause; yet it must be regarded as Limit also, since it is an element, along with pleasure, in the Mixed Life which alone wins Plato's approbation. Pleasure, as such, is classed as unlimited (31 a), but elsewhere (52 c-d) intense pleasures alone are so classed, and the others are called 'moderate'. There is a good deal of apparent inconsequence, as in making a show of admitting into the good life pleasures which 'cannot be done without', or which 'accompany health and virtue'—could there have been any serious question of excluding these? A literal interpretation of some passages (50 b, 62 e, 63 e) would mean that the good life would have to eschew anger, love, and the other emotions—indeed, 'the whole tragedy and comedy of life', for in this sphere pleasure and pain are mixed, and no provision is made for the admission of 'mixed pleasures'. H.'s view of the sixth class of possessions (p. 139) would seem to involve some such drastic treatment of the feelings; but on the whole it appears unlikely that this was Plato's meaning. Thus apart from the general contention for the superiority of intelligence over pleasure, the conclusion of the dialogue remains vague and disputable. As a clue to the Platonic ethics of pleasure it must be regarded as a much less valuable document than *Gorg.*, *Rep.* ix, or *Laws* ii.

H. solves some of these puzzles by bringing out clearly the ambiguities in the use of such words as 'mixed' and 'unlimited'; the latter, for example, sometimes means 'devoid of limit' and sometimes 'devoid of the right degree of limit'. His clarification of the Mixed Life is especially valuable: the 'pleas-

ure' which is a constituent of this mixture is not pleasure as such, but 'pleasure' which is already a 'mixture' of pleasure and of the moderation imposed by reason. Though this is not necessarily 'confused thought' on Plato's part, it has been a prolific cause of confusion to Plato's readers. 'Pleasure is for Plato . . . bad in the negative sense that it lacks the right determination without which nothing is good' (p. 103); the goodness of the pleasure which is admitted into the good life is due therefore to 'something outside itself' (p. 134). This most useful analysis, however, seems hard to reconcile with the remark (p. 12) that the thesis of the dialogue 'does not exclude an intrinsic value of pleasure'. But perhaps one should read 'extrinsic'?

H. might have noted (p. 115) that the reason why *μουσική* does not here come under education is that the word here means mere skill in the playing of instruments, and has thus a very much narrower meaning than in, e.g., *Rep.* ii. He might also have noted that 51 c means merely that the pleasure afforded by pictures is not pure, because it may be mixed with the pain of desire, etc. Bosanquet's inaccurate generalizations on Plato and art, which H. appears to accept, can derive no support from the passage. The comparison of *Tim.* with *Phil.* (which has nothing corresponding to the Receptacle) and *Soph.* on matters of ontology fails to convince me that such dicta as 'no mind without a soul' refer only to 'projected' mind; the natural meaning seems to be that *νοῦς* (like *ἦδονή*) must be seated in a soul as subject of inherence; and hence the concept of God as impersonal reason is un-Platonic. H. has an important note on 'Collection' in which he rightly departs from Cornford, who confined the term to the composition of species under a genus. It also means the 'combination of particular sense-perceptions into a one'—I quote Adam, *Rep.* vol. ii, p. 173.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

THE RIDDLE OF THE ACADEMY

Harold CHERNISS: *The Riddle of the Early Academy*. Pp. 103. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Cloth, \$1.50.

THESE three lectures, delivered at Berkeley in 1942, may be said at once to be of the greatest interest and importance to students of Plato and Aristotle. Their conclusions will be further supported by Professor Cherniss's more extensive treatment of Aristotle's criticisms of Plato and the Academy, of which the first volume has already appeared.

It is often stated that 'Aristotle commonly refers' to 'Plato's unwritten doctrine' (Taylor); Plato, it is said, taught in the Academy that both ideas and phenomena are derived from two principles, the One and the Dyad of 'the great and the small'. In sober fact Aristotle refers to the 'unwritten opinions' only once (*Physics*, 209^b13-16), and there merely to state that they agree with his interpretation of *Timaeus*. As this interpretation is not borne out by the dialogue, it is conceivable, C. argues, that his interpretation of the 'unwritten opinions' may also be untrustworthy.

This suspicion is increased by C.'s argument that the Platonic dialogues lend no colour to the view that for Plato either ideas or phenomena are constituted by two elements, material and formal, or that 'mathematicals' exist as mediators between the two worlds, or that the 'matter' of the ideas is the cause of evil or their 'form' (the One) the cause of good. The discrepancies between the dialogues and Aristotle's account of Platonism have been variously explained. Some reject completely Aristotle's testimony. Others think that the ideas of the dialogues were transformed later into idea-numbers. It has become fashionable to say that the latter theory was taught orally by Plato and never committed to writing by him for reasons adduced from *Phaedr.* and *Ep.* vii. Hence the one lecture—on the Good—which Plato is reported by our authorities to have given, is commonly magnified into a systematic course of

esoteric instruction variously reconstructed by modern conjectures. The fact that the lecture on the Good was delivered to a popular audience, and that, as C. convincingly shows, it contained no identification of ideas and numbers, might well have given pause to those who seek to father an esoteric doctrine on Plato. They can gain no support from the 'unwritten opinions' mentioned in *Physics*. The other passage to which they appeal, *De Anima*, 404^b18-27, really refers to Aristotle's own work 'On Philosophy' and deals not with Plato but with Xenocrates. C.'s most telling argument, however, is the consideration that besides ascribing to Plato the theory of idea-numbers Aristotle by a significant inconsistency also represents the Platonic ideas as 'eternal sensibles', and, as such, useless and self-contradictory. Once C. has pointed it out, it is obvious enough that Aristotle was not thinking of the ideas as numbers when in *Physics*, 139^b35 ff. he objected to ideas of 'flesh', 'bone', etc., on the ground that these ideas are not separable from the sensibles *even in thought*.

C. concludes that the theory of idea-numbers does not belong to Plato; it is an 'interpretation' devised by Aristotle, in accordance with his usual polemical method, for the purpose of lumping Plato together with Xenocrates and Speusippus, or again with the Pythagoreans, and so disposing of them all by a single refutation. C. holds also that Plato's work in the Academy lay in setting problems to thinkers like Eudoxus, and helping them with general advice and criticism; he was in no sense a 'master' giving set courses, or even a director of a seminar. It is impossible to summarize C.'s close-knit argumentation. He draws confirmation, sometimes by rather subtle reasoning, from many quarters, including the studies prescribed for various age-groups in *Rep.* vii, and the rival interpretations (and misinterpretations) of Plato current in the early Academy. C. nowhere discusses the point that the dialogues of

Plato seem deliberately to imply a considerable background of teaching or discussion of philosophical principles. But this is not an objection to his main thesis on idea-numbers, which seems to me worthy of general acceptance. My own acceptance of it is, I am sure, not mere

wishful thinking on the part of one who has found little but obscurity and mystification in the modern reconstructions of the allegedly Platonic theory of idea-numbers.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

ARISTOTLE ON PLATO

Harold CHERNISS, *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*, Vol. I. Pp. xxvi+610. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. Cloth, \$5.00 (33s. 6d.).

ARISTOTLE has remarked that one need not always suppose that a man means what he says. Hence he finds the key to understanding the 'real meaning' of earlier philosophers not so much in verbal analysis of what they actually said as in the application of his own concepts to their statements. In an earlier book, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, Professor Cherniss has sought to show that this method has led Aristotle to read into his predecessors many beliefs which they would scarcely have acknowledged as their own. In the present work he proposes to examine the specific criticisms and interpretations of Plato and Plato's associates which are scattered throughout the works of Aristotle. The first volume collects in three lengthy chapters, first, the attacks on the Platonic method of division and on certain definitions, secondly, the criticisms of the alleged doctrine of 'Platonic matter', and thirdly, the refutations of the Platonic view of matter and form. The second volume will include a general characterization of Aristotle's methods of criticism, and an attempt to relate his philosophy to the teachings of Plato and Plato's successors. The tables of references which it will contain will, no doubt, make somewhat easier the task of finding C.'s treatment of particular passages in the present volume.

A complete conspectus of Aristotle's references to Plato and the Platonists would appear to be a necessary preliminary to a settlement—if a settlement is possible—of the debate among

modern scholars on the validity of Aristotle's testimony, particularly as regards the crucial question whether Plato ever identified ideas and numbers. C.'s answer to that question is already plain and well argued; he promises a fuller treatment, however, in the second volume. The chief merit of C., as compared with Robin, is that he everywhere seeks to compare Aristotle with the relevant Platonic texts. If he has sometimes intermingled speculations with his arguments, and holds up progress with laborious criticisms of Plato, Aristotle, and the commentators ancient and modern, his excuse lies in the attempt to make his treatment exhaustive. The almost preternatural industry with which he has sought to achieve this aim makes it perhaps ungracious to suggest that it might at times have been more effective, as well as more merciful to his readers, to substantiate his point of view by a more sparing use of significant details. Students of the ancient texts will, however, find this a most serviceable volume, even if it is a little difficult to use.

If there is any defect in C.'s equipment, it is an undue lack of sympathy with the Aristotelian point of view. Many excellent observations of Aristotle's do not receive due weight, tending rather to be swallowed up in less important matters. It was surely a considerable clarification of thought when Aristotle objected to the Platonic definition of soul as the self-moved mover, on the ground that self-motion is not essential to soul, but only a mode of its operation, which it may or may not exercise. It could easily be argued that in defining soul as self-motion Plato failed to do full justice to his own doctrine. It was an equally great service when Aristotle explained that Plato was wrong in

taki
stan
vari
and
phy:
twe
Aris
poin
illus
'rec
'rec
plete
ligib
spur
Plat
the p
cept
hand
cept
void
with
It se
own
char
tend
seem
with
read
appa
a hig
in ta
lute
differ
ter'
(who

Eliza
sa
Ne
\$2
THIS
and
Profe
early
mate
in he
publi
auth
An e
follow
man

taking permanence as the mark of substantial reality; or when he showed from various points of view that 'the great and the small' is an unsatisfactory metaphysical principle. The difference between the philosophic standpoint of Aristotle and the 'textualist' standpoint of Professor Cherniss might be illustrated by the treatment of the 'receptacle' in *Timaeus*. For C. the 'receptacle' is just the 'receptacle', completely formless and therefore unintelligible (though apprehensible by 'a spurious kind of reasoning', whatever Plato meant by that); the question of the philosophic usefulness of such a concept is ignored. Aristotle, on the other hand, tried to make sense of the 'receptacle'; he can identify it with the void, with 'the great and the small', with falsity, or with absolute non-being. It seems to him, in fact, very like his own *ὕλη*, save that it lacks the necessary character of potency or 'privation', and tends to fade into sheer negation. It seems, then, that C. tends to be content with words, whereas Aristotle tried to read the *mind* of Platonism. If Aristotle apparently treated the text of Plato in a high-handed manner, as, for example, in taking *τὸ μὴ ὂν* of *Soph.* to mean absolute non-being instead of the idea of difference, or in making 'Platonic matter' an element of the ideas themselves (whose multiplicity would seem in any

case to demand some such principle), it might nevertheless be contended that his method, so far from deserving C.'s castigations, is fundamentally correct. What else, indeed, would Plato himself have had his pupils do, save think out for themselves the problems which he had succeeded in formulating?

On at least one point C. treats the text of Plato as brusquely as ever Aristotle did. I refer to the passage of *Rep.* x which states in plain language (see the unassailable interpretation of Adam on 597^a24) the doctrine of God as maker (*φύρουργός*) of the ideas. It is not true that Plato here 'contradicts all the rest of his writings', or that he is guilty of 'opportunistic shiftings' in order to abbreviate his argument unfairly. Indeed, even if he *were* using 'perversely' 'the fundamental concepts of his metaphysics' for this specific argument, they assuredly remain his 'fundamental concepts'. This plain, non-mythical passage of *Rep.* is worth innumerable speculations based on rhetorical and ambiguous remarks from *Tim.* and *Phaedr.* The theory which makes God subordinate to the ideas is hardly recognizable as a philosophy, much less as related in any way to the Platonism known to thinkers throughout the centuries.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

GREEK ROMANCE

Elizabeth Hazelton HAIGHT: *More Essays on Greek Romances*. Pp. xi+215. New York: Longmans, 1945. Cloth, \$2.50.

THIS volume is intended to supplement and enrich the picture already given by Professor Haight of the fiction of the early Roman Empire, and it comprises material which she was unable to include in her *Essays on the Greek Romances* published in 1943.¹ The contents, as the author confesses, are heterogeneous. An essay on the Alexander Romance is followed by a discussion of three 'romances of the spirit', a description

which covers the Acts of Paul and Thecla and of Xanthippe and Polyxena and the Life of Apollonius of Tyana. The volume is concluded by two 'studies in comparative literature', Apuleius and Boccaccio and Apollonius of Tyre and Shakespeare's *Pericles*, and two appendixes, of which the first sets out in parallel columns (a) the facts and (b) the tendencies and ideologies of Alexander's life, while the second offers the original Latin of certain passages of Boccaccio which are translated and discussed in the fifth essay.

Professor Haight's plan and outlook are closely akin to those apparent in her earlier volume, and they are open to the

¹ See C.R. lviii (1943), p. 114.

same general criticism. She is painstaking and enthusiastic, but neither convincing nor inspiring. The first four essays contain a little introductory matter of no particular interest and a summary of the book under discussion, followed by a repetition of some parts of the summary adorned (I cannot say illuminated) by moral observations and illustrated by parallels which are sometimes of doubtful relevance. In that some of the matter with which she deals is little known, Professor Haight's work may be useful as an introduction; but she has in fact little or nothing to say that is both new and illuminating, and too much to say that is wrong or misleading. For discerning moral motives in the Christian romances she has justification, but her efforts to find them in the Alexander Romance are as barren as her earlier efforts to prove that the pagan novelists were preachers in disguise; and her view of the intention of Philostratus in writing the life of Apollonius of Tyana is painfully reminiscent of her view of the intention, e.g., of Xenophon of Ephesus—'Philostratus has written out of the restless cravings of that time another romance to help men escape from the burden of their fears to life's fairer possibilities' (p. 112).

The studies in comparative literature are not very profound and are characterized by some remarkable rhetorical conceptions. 'By one of those striking literary affinities which seem to substantiate the doctrine of the transmigration of souls the spirit of Apuleius of

Madaura seems reincarnated in Boccaccio of Certaldo' (p. 113). Professor Haight proceeds to compare the two authors in their attitude to the stories which they tell in common, and after a rather tedious discussion of the allegorical and mystical element in each she comes to the prosaic, though correct, conclusion that 'beyond implicit or described allegory the tale itself (Cupid and Psyche) has for each a self-sufficient justification as a form of art. Boccaccio, "poet, critic, scholar", owes his fame as did Apuleius, sophist, philosopher, and priest to his peerless art of story-telling' (p. 141). The discussion of Apollonius of Tyre in relation to Shakespeare's *Pericles* indicates that Professor Haight is no more adept as a critic of English than she is as a critic of Greek and Roman literature. Few will agree with her that Lawrence Twine's translation of Tharsia's song (Ap. Tyr. xxxv) is a beautiful Elizabethan lyric (p. 185) or that Shakespeare could not have done better if he had wished. Nor do I think that Professor Haight has much future as a theatrical producer if she really believes that a production of the *Pericles* with great actors, simple scenery, and *haunting music* (my italics) would project the deep humanity of the play across the footlights (p. 189).

Professor Haight's two volumes of essays on the Greek Romances comprise more than four hundred pages in all. I think it is legitimate to ask *cui bono?*

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ROMAN POETICAL THEORY

Lawrence RICHARDSON: *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome*. An Analytical discussion of the Shorter Narrative Poems written in Latin during the First Century before Christ. Pp. 173. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1944. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.

THIS undergraduate prize essay is an examination of four poems, Catullus lxiv and the *Ciris*, *Culex*, and *Moretum*; in view of this choice it is something of

a shock to be told that the author has 'found it prudent to disregard, as far as possible, the influence of Alexandrian poetry on Roman poetry' and to consider the Latin *epyllia* in isolation. His study of the 'Form and Structure' of the poems is an elaborate analysis in terms of balance and symmetry. When he proceeds to deal with their 'Poetical Theory' we get another surprise; we find him using as a basis of criticism the precepts laid down by Aristotle in the

Poetics. He sees no incongruity in applying to these Alexandrian *epyllia* a set of canons based on Sophoclean tragedy; the Principal of Aberdeen's translation can rarely have been put to so odd a use. Plot, Thought, Diction, Character—he makes his way through the whole series; supported by the Aristotelian observation that 'when the choice is good, then the character may be said to be good', he is enabled to conclude that the Gnat is a good character. ('The omission of conscious choice on the part of the gnat', he warns us in a footnote, 'does not hamper our estimate of his good character. His manifested moral purpose is sufficient evidence of this.') Even Spectacle does not defeat him: 'it is usually divorced from the necessary course of action, but it is integrated into the poem by its pertinence.' It is a pity that so devout an Aristotelian should not know the meaning of *catharsis*, but Mr. Richardson's ignorance of it does not prevent him from using so impressive a word: he speaks of 'a scene of catharsis or decision' and tells us that in the 'central panel' of the *Ciris* 'we see that the

core of the action is the catharsis of Scylla'.

Mr. Richardson does not lack self-confidence (he speaks of 'my discoveries') and he takes himself and his opinions very seriously; he will not have the *neoterici* called over-fastidious and precious, because 'I cannot be persuaded to pronounce a negative judgment of value against exact craftsmanship'. This sentence is a fair specimen of his style; he loves phrases like 'kinetic intensity' and 'dynamic symmetries' and his English is generally tortuous and clumsy, sometimes almost unintelligible.

No doubt it did Mr. Richardson good to compose this essay; it would have done him more good if he had been made to prune its verbiage, to discard his oracular manner, and to supplement the *Poetics* with the Alexandrians in Greek. As for the 'Committee on Undergraduate Prize Essays' which selected the work for publication, it has not, presumably, the excuse of youth.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

VIRGIL IN ENGLISH VERSE

R. C. TREVELYAN: *Virgil: The Eclogues and the Georgics*, translated into English Verse. Pp. iii + 118. Cambridge: University Press, 1944. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

It is an ancient dispute whether a poem can best be transferred from one language to another by adhering as closely as possible, consistently with the genius of the second language, to the wording of the original, or whether 'poesie is of so subtle a spirit, that in pouring out of one language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new spirit is not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *caput mortuum*'.

Mr. Trevelyan, who speaks of himself as

labouring to transplant
These tender flowers of delicate Latin speech
Into an alien soil,

is a most distinguished member of the company of translators who believe that

fidelity gives the truest idea of the original. He is equipped for his undertaking with a fine scholarship, a notable craftsmanship in verse, and a fastidious choice of language, which refrains from all phrases that might obtrude the translator's own personality, and usually avoids the threadbare schoolroom version. That he can rise to eloquence when the occasion demands may be exemplified by the following sample of his work:

How often saw we
Aetna forth from her bursting furnaces
With fiery rivers flood the fields of Sicily,
Vomiting balls of fire and molten rocks!
Arms clashing in the sky Germania heard,
And with unwonted shuddering the Alps quaked.
A voice too mid the silence of sacred groves
Was heard of many—a mighty voice; and phantoms,
Pale in wondrous wise, were seen when night
Grew dim; and cattle spoke, a fearful portent!

In his introduction Mr. Trevelyan confesses to a feeling that the *Georgics*

are perhaps the most impossible of all poems to translate; for 'interesting as the meaning may be in itself, it contributes very little to the beauty of the poetry'. In spite of all his merits Mr. Trevelyan cannot avoid presenting the modern reader with a devitalized Virgil; he can convey the meaning, he can convey something of Virgil's sureness of touch, of his economy of language, of his taste; but the music is muted, the evocativeness, the suggestiveness, the memorableness of the language has necessarily gone.

Translators of the Classics must remember that their readers do not know many things that were known by ancient readers and have been learned by modern scholars. To help the modern reader over the obstacles caused by his ignorance is a duty which has been too little recognized. This help may be given by notes (with which Mr. Trevelyan makes a beginning) or by adjustments to the text. Mr. Trevelyan is prepared at times to simplify or eliminate allusions (cf. *fields of Sicily* for *Cyclopus agros* in the passage quoted), but he could with advantage have gone farther in remembering Horace's advice

nec uerbum curabis reddere, fidus
interpres.

What is the modern reader to make of this?

But if about my heart the blood grown chill
Forbids me to explore those realms of nature.

For him it is *fright* that makes the blood grow chill; he does not, like Virgil's contemporaries, regard the heart as the seat of the *intellect*, nor, like the scholar, remember Empedocles' line

αἷμα γὰρ ἀνθρώποις περικάρδιον ἐστὶ νόημα.

Or consider this passage:

Withies grow thick

On willows, leaves on elms; but strong spear-shafts
On myrtle and on the cornel trusty in battle;
While yews are bent into Ituraean bows.

Contrast Mr. Day Lewis's rendering:

Willows provide our withies, elm-leaves fodder for
cattle,

But myrtle bears tough spear-shafts, cornel your
cavalry lances,
Good in battle, while bows from Ituraean yew are
fashioned.

Not only does this explain the use of elm-leaves, but it also brings out explicitly in the first clause what is in a typical fashion only implied by the Latin. Every teacher knows this constant difficulty presented by Latin poetry: the pupil understands the words and the construction, but does not see the *bearing* of the sentence. The translator should be careful that his English does not present the same difficulty through following the Latin too closely.

In his translation of the *Eclogues* Mr. Trevelyan experiments with a new metre, consisting of unrhymed lines each of which is 'the normal half-stanza of the English ballad', but with the differences that the caesura is movable, the fourth stress may be omitted, and two extra syllables may be added at the end. My own impression is that Mr. Trevelyan, who is very free with inverted stresses, has tried to innovate too much at once: his lines are often difficult to read and do not suggest the nature of Virgil's hexameters. In the *Eclogues* they have a sweetness of sound and a balance of short sentences which seem to call for rhyme in an English version; for rhyme has a similar unmistakable music and similarly marks out the verse into short and balanced phrases. The want of rhyme is particularly felt in the shepherds' competitive songs. For all his inaccuracy and licence Dryden gives a truer general impression of the genuinely pastoral pieces:

Galatea hits me with an apple—ah the wanton
girl!—

And flees into the willows, but hopes to be seen
first.

My Phyllis me with pelted apples plies,
Then tripping to the woods the wanton hies;
And wishes to be seen before she flies.

In translation however *non omnia possumus omnes*, and the Trevelyans are as much needed as the Drydens.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE GEORGICS

P. D'HÉROUVILLE: *L'Astronomie de Virgile*. Pp. viii+33. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1940. Paper, 9 fr.

P. D'HÉROUVILLE: *Géorgiques I-II: Champs, Vergers, Forêts*. Pp. 155. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1942. Paper, 30 fr.

THESE two little works are a continuation and completion of the author's *A la Campagne avec Virgile* (1930; reviewed in C.R. xlv. 79), which discoursed of the principal subjects of the Third and Fourth Georgics. The smaller of the two summarizes Virgil's allusions to astronomical matters and his use of astronomical terms, with full references and a few brief discussions, of which the most important gives the proof that *Anguis* in *Georg.* i. 244 refers to the constellation Draco, not (as some editors have assumed) *Serpens* or *Ophiuchus*. A glance at the useful chart of the heavens on p. 21, and at the parallel passage of Aratus, are really sufficient proof. The author is also right as regards the *sidus Piscis aquosi* (*Georg.* iv. 234)—though he does not discuss the difficulty of the singular as referring to the constellation *Pisces*—and also as regards *Georg.* i. 396, *nec fratris radiis obnoxia surgere Luna*, and he gives a useful note (p. 25) on Virgil's uses of *axis*.

The larger booklet covers on a smaller scale the ground more completely covered by the fine work of R. Billiard, *L'Agriculture dans l'antiquité* (1928), so far as concerns the first two Georgics. It is for the most part a simple summary of what Virgil says about soils and their treatment, implements, the several kinds of grain-bearing plants, the selection and medication of seeds, the operations of agriculture (explaining all the terms used by the poet) and the enemies of the crops. The following sections treat of Olives, Fruits, Trees (Chestnut, Beech, Elm, Ash, and, above all, Oak, including *aesculus* and *ilex*), Vineyard

and Vine, and there are two appendices, the first about weather-signs and winds and their names, the second about Conifers. Under each heading there are all the appropriate references, and many quotations from modern authors, especially French. A few of the familiar difficulties of interpretation are discussed, for the most part very briefly and sometimes without coming to any conclusion. One of the chief problems, the precise calendar of ploughings and fallowings which Virgil has in his mind in the first Georgic, is not really considered; it admits of solution by careful attention to the text, but few commentators are clear about it. The author differs from Sargeaunt in regard to the difficult passage (*Georg.* ii. 302 ff.) *neve oleae silvestris insere truncos . . .*, and also in identifying *aesculus* with *Quercus pedunculata*, *nux* (*Georg.* i. 187) with the almond instead of the walnut, and *cedrus* with the cedar of Lebanon rather than with *Juniperus oxycedrus*. In all these cases Sargeaunt is probably right, but the author argues bravely. He is very unwilling to allow that Virgil may be mistaken, and puts up a gallant defence of the poet's over-optimistic view of the possible results of grafting (*Georg.* ii. 69-72); in regard to this he adduces evidence which certainly has to be considered. A somewhat fuller treatment of the implements of agriculture, including the plough, might have been given, and one or two illustrations would here have been helpful: the meaning of *currus* in *Georg.* i. 174 is left uncertain.

The book is very pleasant to read; the author's love both for the poet and for the subjects of his poems is most attractive, and a student who desires a brief (but fairly complete) summary of the matter of the poems will not go far wrong if he seeks it here.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

SENECA'S DIALOGUES

Seneca's *Dialogues* I, II, VII, VIII, IX, X (Miscellaneous Moral Essays). The Text Emended and Explained by William Hardy ALEXANDER. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume XIII, no. 3, pp. 49-92.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Paper, 50 cents.

THIS extract consists of just over a hundred notes on passages in six of the *Dialogi* of Seneca. They might have been considerably reduced in number. Eight of them repeat suggestions which Mr. Alexander has already made elsewhere, nearly half are expressions of opinion, which contain nothing new, concerning this or that reading or interpretation, and sixteen more are superfluous. For instance, at i. 6. 7 Mr. Alexander defends *quis* by citing *Ep.* 117. 23, but that was done by Mr. B. Axelson in 1939 in a work to which Mr. Alexander refers on p. 50 with the false date of 1934. Mr. Alexander's proposal to delete *iunctas* in ix. 11. 7 was made long ago by Hertz, as is recorded by Gertz, by the Teubner editor Hermes, and by Castiglioni. At x. 7. 6 Mr. Alexander's proposal to insert *non* before *intellegeret* was made by Muretus. At x. 9. 1 Mr. Alexander's proposal, which he now makes for the second time, is nothing but a combination of Housman's and of Philippon's which is not mentioned. At x. 14. 5 Mr. Alexander's suggestion was made by Philippon in *Gnomon*, vii, 1931, p. 375.

The remaining third of Mr. Alexander's paper has some reason for publication, but it is not possible to speak highly of much of it. At vii. 25. 4 Mr. Alexander strangely suggests *iura reges per me nationum petant* for *iura reges*

penatium petant in preference to Gertz's *iura reges nationum petant a me* and does not mention the likelihood that the *pe* of *penatium* is an anticipation of the first two letters of *petant*. From the fact that *in usu posita* in *Ep.* 114. 14 means 'expressions employed in everyday life' how does it follow that *o uos usu maxime felices* in vii. 27. 5 means 'you who are at your happiest in your life of every day'? Is the expression *imperia praetorum sequi* at ix. 1. 10 with the meaning not of 'to obey the orders of magistrates' but of 'to aim at the powers of magistrates' at all likely in view of the following *sequor Zenona*? In the analysis of the clausula *detrimenti latentis* at x. 8. 4 why is the second syllable of *detrimenti* scanned as short? At ii. 9. 4 *in altum demittat*, with which compare v. 13. 6 *iram . . . in altum retrahat nec dolorem suum profiteatur* and Justin viii. 5. 11 *dolor, hoc altius demissus quo minus profiteri licet*, I do not know why Mr. Alexander insists that Seneca's phrase means 'sink in the depths of the sea'. At ix. 10. 5 it was not Axelson but Castiglioni before him who defended in *longinqua* by citing *Ep.* 5. 8. In the note on x. 12. 3, which contains nothing new, it might have been mentioned that a possessive adjective is attached to *res publica* as early as Livy, *praef.* 10. Suggestions that seem worth considering are i. 5. 9 *hunc passa est*, ii. 6. 8 *habent ista hostile fastigium*, ii. 12. 3 *pueros malos*, ii. 18. 1 *mirabili ferebatur cura*, and ix. 11. 1 *facit nostram seque ipsum*. Mr. Alexander withdraws previous suggestions of his own at ii. 9. 1, ii. 13. 2, vii. 2. 2, vii. 10. 3, vii. 25. 1, and ix. 7. 4, and in part at i. 6. 7.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

GREEK AND LATIN EPITAPHS

Richmond LATTIMORE: *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xxviii, Nos. 1-2.) Pp. 335. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1942. Paper, \$3.

DR. LATTIMORE has given us a handsome volume, carefully planned and furnished with a wealth of quotations on a subject of universal interest. To borrow a Tacitean phrase, 'you can see at once

that it is a delightful book, you are tempted to think it a great one'. The first clause needs no discussion, the second shall be considered a little later.

Epitaphs are written in a great variety of tones—solemn, grim, hopeful, pessimistic, indifferent, earnest. A few illustrations, picked more or less at random, will give an idea of the richness of the theme. There is a grim curse on the disturber of a tomb. 'May he fall foul of the daemons of black Hecate', that is, of children dead before their time (p. 112 f.). A singularly satisfying and complete curse (in prose) is quoted (pp. 116, 117). A very bad woman, Acte, is denounced in very bad verse (p. 124). Offerings of flowers at tombs were, of course, frequent, but sometimes as much as a bull was required (pp. 126 ff.). There is a touch of Omar Khayyam when a friend wishes for Vibius that 'all about him' may turn into flowers (p. 130). It is a natural turn of thought to call the beloved dead cruel for leaving their friends: it is rather strange when the epithet 'cruel' is applied to the survivors (p. 181). Complete boredom with life can produce such a readiness for death, as is illustrated by a long epitaph in iambic senarii (p. 210). We have an immediate sympathy for the dead man honoured 'quod in incendio restinguendo interit' (p. 226). The stranger who stops to read is often abundantly blessed, e.g. 'tu qui perleges, vivas valeas, ames amaris' (p. 236). The attitude of Sardapalus towards death is often echoed, e.g. 'quod edi bibi mecum habeo, quod reliqui, perdidi' (p. 261). The 'factio Veneta' rises to a true sincerity and independence in commemorating one of its heroes, Fuscus (p. 273). Points that will specially interest students of Roman religion are the identification of the dead with deities (pp. 303 ff.), and the rule of Fortune—usually taken to be an unkind power (pp. 149 ff., 154 ff.).

Just one or two queries. Why should the epitaph at the foot of p. 218 be interpreted as 'astrological'? It only says,

'Stop, dear father, do not weep for me. From my birth I was destined to leave the sweet daylight.' On p. 221 (middle of page) can οὐδὲν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδιον mean 'Nothing human is sure of privacy'? Is it not rather 'Nothing in the world is really a man's own'?

The few passages quoted will illustrate the variety of the book. The reader will hunt out for himself and treasure the occasional gems of unprofessional poetry that can be produced in the crucible of strong and sincere emotion. The rare triumphs of poets almost mute form a valuable supplement to the surer triumphs of the masters.

The epitaph brings us into touch with people of all classes and temperaments, and with their attitude towards the supreme fact of death. It is, therefore, one of the more promising roads towards an understanding of a problem that interests many of us more even than politics or war. What was life like in the living to the individual and how did he face it and its close? The ancient epitaph promises more than the modern, which is normally couched in terms of conventional piety, expressed within a limited range of language. The infidel seldom writes his epitaph—at least, no suitable one. The ancient world seems to have unbosomed itself at the graveside of all its hopes and fears, its tenderness and its bitterness alike. This immense variety has this disadvantage, that it almost defeats the attempt to draw general conclusions. After reading Dr. Lattimore's book one is certainly richer by much fine and curious lore. It is hard to say if one really knows much more about the ancient view of death—except that it was not uniform. Perhaps, when one has read the whole book carefully and allowed it to settle into shape, some more definite picture will appear; and if this should be the case, the temptation to regard this good book as a great one need not be too sternly resisted.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

MODERN PROBLEMS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

Frank Burr MARSH: *Modern Problems in the Ancient World*. Pp. 123. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1943. Cloth, \$1.

THIS volume is published as a memorial of the late Professor Marsh's thirty years' service in the History School of the University of Texas, and in particular his tenure of a Research Professorship in 1934, when the three Roman chapters here printed were delivered as lectures; to them are prefixed two others on Athenian subjects. Both sections follow the angle of approach indicated in the title, that of looking at the ancient world in the light of the modern situation—especially the American—and they illustrate both its advantages and its dangers. The book as a whole, though comparatively slight, and 'popular' in its method (the arguments being presented without documentation), is a welcome supplement to his three earlier and larger ones—all of which, by the way, were published in England, either originally or in revised editions.

The first chapter, on Solon's 'New Deal', makes some rather hazardous assumptions for the sake of the modern analogy: as that seventh-century Athens already had a fully developed money economy; or that the Athenian peasant used to make his living by growing corn for the market and was losing it through the competition of cargoes from the Euxine. The 'Constitution of Draco' described in *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 4 is accepted as historical and adduced to explain the bearing and purpose of some of Solon's political reforms—e.g. the property qualification for archons; whereas the 'Dracontian' rating (10 minae) is not more than one-fifth of the Solonian (πεντακοσιομέδμνος).

In 'Unemployment and Imperialism' the familiar story of how the League of Delos was transformed into the Athenian Empire is clearly and—within the limits of its brevity—convincingly told, and there is an interesting suggestion of why ostracism became a regular

method of party strategy. Marsh attributes this to the fluctuating and uncertain character of the Assembly, in which an important decision of policy at one meeting might be reversed or nullified at the next by a mere difference in the numbers attending; so that the leaders of the actual majority party—that which we call the 'Democrats'—were led to demand the removal of their chief opponents in order to give their own policies a chance of continuity. Similarly, the failure either to 'federate' the Delian Allies or to absorb them into the Athenian citizenship was due to the same fear of losing the steady poor men's majority in the Assembly. True: but how far was 'unemployment' in anything like the modern sense a factor in all this? If the members of the sovereign Assembly feared the competition of slave or alien labour, why did they in fact allow slaves and aliens the same rates of pay as themselves for work on public buildings, as the Erechtheum accounts show?

The three Roman chapters form a continuous sequence, trying to define and answer some questions in the last century of the Republic which Marsh thinks neglected or too lightly passed over in the history books. For instance, why the supremacy of the Senate was accepted by the sovereign Assemblies for so long—which is not explained by the Senate's continuous success, for the period shows many 'ghastly exhibitions of incompetence': Marsh's explanation (worked out in detail in his earlier volume on the period 146–30 B.C.) is what he calls the 'machine' by which the *nobiles* managed the voting registers of the *tribus*—which would be plausible enough, were it not for the absence of any definite evidence of it in the sources (apart from such possible hints as may be taken from phrases in the *Commentariolum petitionis* of Quintus Cicero). But the main argument and interest of these chapters is that which concerns the New Army and its relation to the Senate: in which connexion Marsh lays special

stress on the crisis of 100 B.C., when for the first time the Senate was confronted with the demands of a large 'proletarian' army and, failing to meet, or indeed to understand, them, forfeited

the power to control such a force in future.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

POLYBIUS AND BOEOTIA

Michel FEYEL: *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au III^e siècle avant notre ère*. Pp. 329; one map. Paris: de Boccard, 1942. Paper.

In this volume M. Feyel tests Polybius' brief sketch of the third-century history of Boeotia (xx. 4-7) against the findings of epigraphy and archaeology. As a preliminary he discusses the chronology of the federal archons; and he subjects the internal affairs of Boeotia to an intensive study, covering military institutions, coinage, land tenure, public festivals, and political life. F.'s previous work as an epigraphist was such as to guarantee the soundness of this book; but it is a truly remarkable achievement to have proposed (and in most cases to have justified with solid arguments) so many radical modifications of the accepted tradition in a period which is comparatively well documented. F.'s book is an excellent example of how a 'regional study' can become an instrument for penetrating behind a one-sided literary source.

F. propounds a new chronology for the Demetrian War. On the assumption that a series of Megarian proxeny decrees (*IG* vii. 1-14; 3473; Heath, *BSA*, 1913, 82 ff., i, ii, iii) refer not to Demetrius Poliorcetes (as everyone has hitherto assumed) but to Demetrius II, he dates to 237/6 the battle of Phylacia, Demetrius' arrival in Boeotia, and his seizure of Megara, which remained Macedonian till 229. For the dating of these inscriptions to c. 235 rather than to c. 300 F. uses four arguments. Of these two are prosopographical and indecisive; the other two, which are epigraphic, involve the weighing of fine points of lettering. If these are sound, so are F.'s conclusions. But ultimately only the epigraphist can decide. Meanwhile one may enter the *caveat* that, despite the note on p. 103, a Macedonian occupation

of Megara from 236 to 229 is hard to reconcile with Polyb. xx. 6. 8: *Μεγαρεῖς γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἐπολιτεύοντο μετὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀπὸ τῶν κατ' Ἀντίγονον τὸν Γονατᾶν χρόνων*.

The account of Boeotian policy during Doson's reign is well argued and sensible. F. has convinced me that the Larymna episode (Polyb. xx. 5. 7 f.) does not imply a breach between Boeotia and Macedon prior to 227 (for the pro-Macedonian Neon was already hipparch), and also that from Polyb. ii. 49. 6 one must infer that Boeotia was allied with Achaea rather than Macedon when Cercidas went to Pella in 227/6. The Phocian and Boeotian hostages honoured by the Achaeans (*Syll.*³ 519) were surrendered, as Treves argued, to guarantee this Achaean alliance, and were evidently returned when Doson marched south in autumn 224. Since Cleomenes was already on the defensive when Megara joined Boeotia in that year (Polyb. xx. 6. 8), F. suggests very plausibly that it was ceded by the Achaeans at Doson's request, as part of the price of help. Polybius concealed this insult to Achaean *amour-propre*, but it explains his hostile attitude towards Boeotia. Incidentally, Doson's willingness to have Megara ceded to Boeotia becomes much more difficult to understand if the town had been Macedonian as recently as 230.

Among the more revolutionary of F.'s views is his belief in Boeotian neutrality in the Social War and virtual (though not technical) neutrality in the First Macedonian War. There is not space to consider his reconstruction of the Social War in detail, but he has a strong case. Here I will discuss only one small point where he seems to have gone wrong, the policy of Epirus. When the war decision of the Symmarchy was presented for ratification in Epirus in 220/19, the Epirotes gave a favourable answer, yet

told Aetolian representatives present that they had voted to remain at peace. Here F. throws Polybius over, arguing (p. 140) that 'the Epirotes refused to associate themselves with a general offensive against Aetolia, but promised military aid should Philip come against the Aetolians, and on each occasion that he came (ἐπειδὴν . . . ἐξενέγκη: Polyb. iv. 30. 4).' The reply was given to both sets of envoys ἐκ παραθέσεως: 'chacune des deux connut forcément la réponse qui était faite à l'autre.' This rendering seems to me perverse and certainly distorts the Greek. In iv. 30. 6 ἐκ παραθέσεως is not 'side by side', but 'on the contrary'; the Epirotes are merely being contrasted with the honest Acarnanians of 30. 2 (cf. xvi. 22. 1). Nor is ἐπειδὴν . . . ἐξενέγκη 'each time that he came', but 'as soon as he took the field'. The Epirotes were out to make the Aetolians think them neutral until Philip could give assistance; no doubt they had been promised the north-western campaign of 219. No wonder the Achaean tradition condemned this cautious policy of exacting a *quid pro quo*! But since no Aetolian attack on Epirus is recorded between the hearing of the envoys and Philip's arrival, the trick evidently succeeded.

F.'s reconstruction of the internal development of Boeotia is necessarily uneven, for what material has survived is largely a matter of chance. His comments on the Boeotian coinage reform are clear and convincing. His account too of the adoption of 'Macedonian' arms after 245 is interesting, and fits into the general picture of military reform in third-century Greece. More technical details would, however, have been welcome. 'Le bouclier lourd (θυρεός)', he writes (p. 194), 'fut remplacé par le bouclier léger (πέλτη)'. But it was as much a question of shape as weight. The θυρεός, the long shield 'like a door', was often a light-armed weapon, as is clear from the account of the Achaean shields before Philopoemen's reform in Plutarch, *Philop.* 9: εὐπετέσι διὰ λεπτότητα καὶ στενωτέροις τοῦ περιστέλλειν τὰ σώματα—like the Galatian *scuta longa* of Livy, 38. 21. 4, which were also too

narrow to cover the body, and evidently identical with the Gallic θυρεοί of Polybius ii. 30. 3. Similarly in Polyb. x. 29. 6 θυρεοφόροι are specifically light-armed troops. On the other hand, the small round πέλται, which took the place of θυρεοί after the reforms in Boeotia, Achaea, and Sparta (Plut. *Cleom.* 11), were part of the equipment of the phalangite; and it seems likely that the πελτοφόροι of the Boeotian inscriptions are the equivalent not of the fourth-century peltasts, but of the πελτασταί of Philip V's armies, who formed a special corps of heavy-armed men like Alexander's hypaspists.

F.'s discussion of Boeotian festivals is acute, but he over-argues his case that they multiplied excessively after 200, and reflect the unhealthy development of Boeotian public life after that date. In fact most of the festivals cannot be dated with certainty; the Theban appeal to the Amphictyony for recognition of the Dionysia is in 228; and the movement as a whole is common to the whole Greek world at this time. This chapter exposes the dangers of drawing specific conclusions from what has merely a general application; and, indeed, throughout his book F. seems to me to exaggerate the sharpness of the break between the sound and prosperous Boeotia of 245–220, and the dismal paradise of demagogues into which Philip V soon transformed it.

The high light in the book is F.'s masterly treatment of *IG* vii. 2433, a list of names from Thebes, some being erased, with mainly Macedonian and Thracian ethnics, which he shows to be a roll of new citizens parallel to contemporary lists surviving from Larissa (*Syll.*³ 543), Pharsalus (*IG* ix. 2. 234 and add.), Phalanna (*IG* ix. 2. 1228 and add.) and Dyme (*Syll.*³ 529). In all these F. rightly sees evidence of Macedonian interference to secure the enrolling of Philip's supporters as citizens; and he treats the Theban inscription as proof of Philip's attempt to dominate Boeotia. Here F. might well have made more of the Achaean parallel. He has not observed that the enrolment at Dyme in spring 218 coincides with the climax of

Ape
of th
the n
of t
tus
oppo
of th
new
para
Theb
signi
lay o
Thes
a pol
scarc
para
impli
to pla
Philip
take
lation
playe
durin
Wh
that i
did n
factio
denig
tache
of P
attach
of thi
gerate
playe
graph
cipal
of Bo

T. SAR
30
map
205.
THIS,
Methu
series
Dr. Ca
Laistr
Greece
eight y
is still
assign
of Chr
was ki

Apelles' intrigue, by which a coalition of the socially dissatisfied elements with the representatives of the western cities of Achaea secured the election of Eperatus of Dyme as Achaeian general in opposition to Aratus. The coincidence of this manoeuvre with the drafting of new citizens into Dyme offers a clear parallel to F.'s interpretation of the Theban inscription. It is especially significant since both Thebes and Dyme lay outside Philip's direct dominion. In Thessaly 'politography' no doubt served a political purpose too; but there it can scarcely have involved an attempt to paralyse social and political life. The implications naturally varied from place to place, and a comprehensive study of Philip's use of the device would have to take into account the transfer of populations, which was one measure employed by Philip to consolidate Macedon during his last decade.

What F. has not quite clearly seen is that in both Achaea and Boeotia Philip did not so much *create* social dissatisfaction as *exploit* it. In his anxiety to denigrate the Boeotians Polybius attaches too little importance to the role of Philip; F. reacting against him attaches too much. My main criticism of this book as a whole is that it exaggerates the part one individual can have played in these events. In his last paragraph F. saddles Philip with 'the principal responsibility for the decadence of Boeotia and the destruction of the

Greek states; he it was who, by governing his protégés as badly as possible, made them ready to succumb miserably upon the first arrival of the legions in Greece'. This over-emphasis on Philip produces a dichotomy and an inconsistency in F.'s book. If Boeotia fell as quickly and as completely under the sway of mere tools of Macedon as Part II suggests, how did it contrive to maintain so successful and independent a foreign policy as that described in Part I? The fact is, the social and economic conditions inside Boeotia were symptomatic of those all over Greece in the late third and second centuries. They are common to Thessaly, Aetolia, Boeotia, and elsewhere, as F. himself admits (p. 276). Philip sought to exploit and exacerbate these conditions for his own political ends, as he did at Messene. The independence of Boeotian foreign policy in both the Social and First Macedonian Wars must indicate that here, as in Achaea, there was a measure of successful resistance.

I have left much in this outstanding book unmentioned. But it will soon receive the detailed study it merits from all whose interests lie in third-century Greece. Not all F. says will be taken into the vulgate; but he has already rendered the *communis opinio* untenable on several major points.

F. W. WALBANK.

University of Liverpool.

FROM AUGUSTUS TO HADRIAN

T. SALMON: *History of the Roman World, 30 B.C.-A.D. 138*. Pp. xiii+363; 5 maps. London: Methuen, 1944. Cloth, 20s. net.

THIS, the sixth volume of Messrs. Methuen's 'Greek and Roman World' series under the general editorship of Dr. Cary, follows the second (Professor Laistner's on 5th- and 4th-century Greece) at an interval of more than eight years: the first of the set of seven is still awaited. This one was originally assigned to the late Mr. R. P. Longden, of Christ Church and Wellington, who was killed in a German bombing raid in

1940. Professor Salmon has had to carry out the work amid the restrictions and distractions of war-time, without the opportunity of access to any of his predecessor's material. Parts of the book have been written under canvas. Inevitably, therefore, it is of rather smaller bulk and slighter calibre than the volumes previously published: in particular, documentation and bibliography have been reduced to a minimum. These necessary limitations must be kept in mind in any attempt to appraise it.

The series as a whole has been designed to strike a mean between the

ordinary one-volume text-book and the big composite volumes of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, each section having the unity of a single authorship but giving room for fuller discussion of the evidence than a text-book allows. Perhaps the General Editor's contribution—the third volume, on Greek History, 323–146 B.C.—might be taken as the ideal or standard for this purpose; though that, indeed, had the advantage of dealing with a period less familiar to most readers and thus giving more opportunities for the demonstration of critical methods, which for students at this stage ought to accompany, but not to overbalance, the mere imparting of information. The author's problem is to attain a just blend of these elements, and probably no author could ever satisfy himself of having done so. In this instance the period is one of the most extensively and intensively worked of the whole range. Professor Salmon expressly repudiates any claim to originality and aims only at 'a reasonably up-to-date synthesis', which on the whole he has achieved—though perhaps 'synopsis' might be a more precise term. The following comments are offered more or less at haphazard.

On the dynastic motive in the Augustan Principate too much is made of the alleged conflict between 'Julians' and 'Claudians'—which should mean members of the *gens Iulia* and the *gens Claudia*—and of the alleged insistence of the army upon having a 'Julian' for its supreme commander. True, Tacitus speaks of the *urbanus miles* as *longo Caesarum sacramento imbutus* (*Hist.* i. 5) and (by the mouth of Galba) of the Roman People as having been *sub Tiberio et Gaio et Claudio unius familiae quasi hereditas* (*ibid.* 16): but of the three Emperors there named, two (by Professor Salmon's way of reckoning) were 'Claudians', and one of these (who was not a *Iulius* even by adoption) was the first to be 'made' directly by the soldiers. The argument, which recurs again and again, seems to assume that all direct descendants, not only of Augustus himself but of his sister Octavia—indeed, all who had any drop

of blood of the Dictator's family—are 'Julians'; and that no others are. But this ignores the Roman laws of patrilinear inheritance and of adoption: Augustus himself, *divi filius*, was a 'Julian' only by adoption; Tiberius had precisely the same right to the name, and in turn conferred it in the same way on Germanicus, who like him was born a 'Claudian'. Marcellus also—whom (in spite of Plutarch, *Ant.* 87) Augustus never adopted—was a 'Claudian' (of the plebeian not the patrician house): yet we are assured that in 23 B.C. Marcellus was 'marked out as successor' because 'the ultimate succession of a Julian must be made clear'. That Augustus did for long hope for a successor of his own blood is not in doubt, and that there was conflict and crisis within his inner circle on the matter is not improbable (see Syme, *Roman Revolution*, ch. xxiii): but the issue was hardly as interpreted by Professor Salmon.

Some other constitutional, legal, and administrative points on which a certain imprecision might be remarked are these. P. 7: is Augustus' action when *quae triumviratu iusserat abolevit* correctly called an 'amnesty'? P. 16: Augustus reckoned his tribunician years as beginning not on December 10 (it was Trajan who introduced that) but on July 1. P. 22: 'by the Julian laws [*sc.* of 18 B.C.] the right to hear appeals was transferred from the People to the Emperor.' What is the textual authority for this? Was not the change the result of the exercise of the *imperium maius* and the *tribunicia potestas* rather than of any specific statutory enactment? P. 45: 'It was ex-consuls who served on the Emperor's Privy Council.' If this means the *semenstre consilium*, its members (other than magistrates) were chosen by lot. Were only consulars admitted to the sortition? P. 45: what is the authority for the statement that (under Augustus) *consules suffecti* 'were appointed on January 9'? P. 98: the legionary *tribuni militum* are described as 'cohort-commanders'. Was not that the function of the *pilus prior*, the tribune being rather a 'brigade-staff-

office
been
poise
lan
siding
a re
then
the l
Tiber
self,
where
was
P. 17
privat
sible
a ver
true,
P. 30
on th
'betw
ing o
Wall
fact t
milec
(whic
Vallu
line o
barrie
P. 32
'gove
had i
some
adher
The
tails.
sion t
casual
neede
F. DE
Int
v+
194
WE
(Mack
Law
based
to ot
many
menta
'man
law-st
fessor

officer'? P. 137: Piso is said to have been first acquitted of the charge of poisoning Germanicus 'under the Sullan law *de sicariis*, Tiberius himself presiding in the court'—which would mean a regular *quaestio perpetua*—and was then sent to answer other charges 'in the High Court of the Senate'. In fact, Tiberius refused to take the case himself, and *integram ad senatum remittit*, where the evidence for the poisoning was heard in full (Tac. *Ann.* iii. 10 f.). P. 170: Claudius 'made the Emperor's private court (*intra cubiculum*) accessible to Roman citizens everywhere'—a very sweeping assertion and, even if true, by no means a 'good thing'. P. 303: the construction of the Vallum on the Tyne-Solway frontier is dated 'between 118 and 121', before the building of the Wall. But the priority of the Wall has been demonstrated, e.g. by the fact that the Vallum is diverted to avoid milecastle No. 50, near Birdoswald (which dates from Platorius Nepos): the Vallum was not originally made as a line of defence northwards, but as 'a barrier against southern marauders'. P. 323: it is hardly accurate to say that 'governors like Pilate and Gallio . . . had investigated the new religion with some care and found no harm in its adherents'.

These are comparatively minor details. But one does receive the impression that the author is apt to pass rather casually over matters on which more is needed than a few facile phrases, some-

times rather worn *clichés* such as might offend a purist—too many 'moot points' and 'highly strategic localities' and 'exceptions that prove the rule'; while at other times he will fill a page or so with not very profound moralizings such as this on the conflict between the Empire and the Christians (p. 321): 'Unfortunately something that is intrinsically good and valuable in itself may provoke disorder. A golden apple is presumably a precious object; but it can sow dissension even among goddesses.' Or, in an appraisal of Hadrian (admittedly the most enigmatic personality of all Augustus' successors), 'Cosmopolitanism has never really inspired men: it has failed to catch their imagination. So far at least in the world's history, it has not been possible to find a spiritual basis for it; men are not prepared to pay it a whole-souled devotion. In this it differs from patriotism, which is not just the refuge of a scoundrel'—a too common misapplication of Johnson's dictum—'but often inspires emotions of the noblest kind and imbues men with a singleness of purpose, which in the past has contributed powerfully to national greatness and human progress.' This kind of thing is sometimes impressive when wrapped in the polysyllabic verbiage of a German professor of the Hitler period: in English it gives itself away more frankly.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

ROMAN LAW

F. DE ZULUETA: *The Roman Law of Sale: Introduction and Select Texts*. Pp. v+265. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945. Cloth, 21s. net.

WE already have two good books (Mackintosh and Moyle) on the Roman Law of Sale. But these are essentially based on *Dig.* 18. 1 and 19. 1 and refer to other texts only incidentally; yet many of these other texts are fundamental, while 18. 1 and 19. 1 contain 'many passages with which the junior law-student can well dispense'. Professor de Zulueta has therefore com-

posed this new 'collection of texts not limited to one or two titles of the *Digest*, dealing with the Roman law of sale, which is the most fruitful subject in Roman law for the English law-student'. Besides the more important parts of 18. 1 and 19. 1 he includes much of 21. 1-2, texts from other titles of *Digest*, *Institutes*, and *Code*, from Gaius, Paul's *Sentences*, and the *Vatican Fragments*, and (most commendably) some non-juristic texts from Cato, Varro, Cic. *De Off.* III, and Aulus Gellius. He gives the *formulae*, as known or conjectured,

of the various actions on sale (something which teachers have always wanted to have in handy form) and he completes his collection with the text of the most important English, American, and French enactments on sale. Greek and German texts he regretfully excludes, because 'Greek law will remain obscure even for the learned until the appearance of Dr. Fritz Pringsheim's expected work, and is in any case too recondite for the ordinary law-student, while the extreme systematization of the German Code makes it impossible to isolate the title *Kauf-Tausch*'. These texts, with translations, occupy Part II, pp. 61-256, of the book. Part I gives in its fifty-nine pages a masterly general introduction to and exposition of the main doctrines of the Roman law of sale. But here too Professor de Zulueta is writing for the law-student, not for the historian or classical scholar. His object is to give a picture of the mature Roman law of sale showing its relation to the 'European common law' on the subject. He therefore does not go deeply into questions

of interpolation; he is hardly at all concerned with the economic and social background of the law; his account of the historical development of the legal rules occupies only three and a half pages and, even so, is prefaced with the apologetic remark that 'a cursory review of the Roman evolution is imposed . . . because without a modicum of historical information Justinian's texts are not fully intelligible'. These three and a half pages are, however, admirable. Particularly worth noting in them are the remarks on the influence (often not appreciated by students) which the existence of the 'powerful and elastic' *stipulatio* had on the historical development of the *bonae fidei* contracts. And a few pages farther on (pp. 22-4) the solution offered for the difficult problem of *arra* deserves serious consideration. On p. 4, l. 19, there appears to be a slip of the pen: 'lent to him by the buyer' should surely be 'lent to him by the seller'.

A. H. CAMPBELL.

University of Birmingham.

TAPESTRIES OF LATE ANTIQUITY

Paul FRIEDLÄNDER: *Documents of Dying Paganism*. Textiles of late antiquity in Washington, New York, and Leningrad. Pp. 66. Coloured frontispiece; 16 plates. Berkeley and Los Angeles; University of California Press, 1945. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE tapestries, perhaps the most important among the many which the dry climate of Egypt has preserved, are studied in the first place for their significance as documents of late antique religion. A wealth of contemporary texts is adduced to explain their subject-matter. A penetrating analysis accounts for every detail, and the complicated syncretism which constitutes the religious programme is brought out impressively. The Hestia Tapestry, now in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection in Washington, is a devotional image—a picture, as it were; a new type of cult image unknown to classical antiquity. Its symmetry and rigid frontality, the

magic spell of the staring eyes of the goddess, make a direct appeal and claim universal submission. Cult images of this kind indeed convey a different message from the statues of the gods of classical Greece: they carry the promise of eternal salvation for the community of initiated.

The other two panels discussed in this book, one in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the other in the Hermitage in Leningrad, pertain to the cult of Cybele. One shows the mutilation of Attis, the other the next consecutive stage of the drama, the moment after the climax. Originally they were parts of liturgical vestments used by priests of Cybele.

The interpretation of the religious significance of the tapestries is the most convincing part of the book. The results, however, of Professor Friedländer's efforts to assign to them a definite place in the artistic development of late

antiquity are rather disappointing. We cannot help feeling that the parallels which he expounds at great length contribute little to an appreciation of the tapestries as works of art. Most of the contemporary examples offer only very general points of comparison; and the analogies with medieval stained glass or with Dugento and Trecento panel pictures might have been relegated to a footnote. The origin and meaning of frontality in late antique art is the subject of an article by C. Hopkins in *Ars Islamica*, vol. iii (1936), which might

have been consulted with advantage. The quotations in the footnotes which refer to the literature of the history of art are not very reliable.

Our knowledge of the imagery of late antique mystery cults is still very limited. Professor Friedländer's book is an important step forward in a field full of interest and promise. Further research on these lines will be welcome to all students of the period of transition from late antique to Early Christian art.

H. BUCHTHAL.

Warburg Institute, London.

THE HORSE IN GREEK ART

Sidney David MARKMAN: *The Horse in Greek Art*. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 35.) Pp. xvii + 211; 62 figures. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1943. Cloth, 30s. net.

THIS is a vast field, and Professor Markman has made a gallant attempt to cover it. He traces the development in the rendering of the horse from the geometric period down to the first century B.C., gives detailed and careful analyses of many monuments, and adds a convenient appendix on the anatomy of the horse. The numerous pictures are of very fair quality and suffice to illustrate the chief points of the text. It is the first systematic treatise to be written on such a scale, and is an important piece of work. Horses are everywhere in Greek art, and as soon as anyone comes across a representation of a horse he will do well to look if it is in Markman, and to ponder what Markman has to say about it.

Special attention is paid to geometric horses, and a serviceable classification offered. Miss Benton's observations in *B.S.A.* 35 might have been quoted.

The treatment of the Homeric references to horse-riding is rather odd. 'When Odysseus gets astride a single beam from the shattered raft like one riding horseback, Homer's description is such as to lead us to the conclusion that this was most uncommon' (p. 8):

all Homer says (*Od.* 5. 371) is *αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀμφ' ἐνὶ δούρατι βαίνει, κέληθ' ὥς ἵππον ἐλαύνων*. 'Horseback riding was considered almost as a circus-trick': but what made the populace stare in *Il.* 15. 679 was not that the man was riding on horseback, but that he kept jumping from one to another of four horses at full gallop: even nowadays this would be regarded by most people as in the nature of circus-riding.

The bronze statuette of Alexander from Herculaneum (p. 102 and fig. 60) and the Amazon in the Villa Borghese (p. 132) are not Hellenistic originals, but copies, and hardly accurate ones. The horses on the Satrap Sarcophagus (p. 119) are very unusual: Markman well compares them, for breed, with those of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia: but goes on to date them in the same period, 470-455, which must be too early. The ears of Selene's horse are alleged to be short (p. 181), but they are broken and it is doubtful how long they were. Similarly, the nostrils of Oinomaos' horse (p. 168 and fig. 34) are daubed with plaster, and this should have been stated when it is said that they 'approach naturalism for the first time'. The Cottenham relief (p. 118) is not 'in Cottenham, England' but in the collection of Professor A. B. Cook at Queens' College, Cambridge: the original publication by Cook in *J.H.S.* 37, pl. 1 might have been cited instead of the derivative one: the date of 495 was

first suggested by Cook. The attitude of the horse on the stele of Lyseas (p. 115) is not the 'flying gallop' as defined by S. Reinach, who invented the term (*R.A.* 1900, i, p. 245), but what he called the 'cabré allongé'. The Kalamis whose chariot received a charioteer by Praxiteles (p. 2) was doubtless the second of the name. The Talos vase is dated too early (p. 121). Markman follows Rumpf in attributing vases of various styles to 'Sakonides' (p. 51), which I think a mistake. Two vases are said to show 'Sakonides' as 'an adventurous innovator' because they show horses in front-view: but that was not a novelty in 560 B.C., since frontal horses had been represented by the beginning of the sixth century (Payne, *N.C.*, p. 74). There is some confusion on p. 52: there are no horses on the Berlin pelike, and the date is about 470, not 520-510. No horses either on the London cup mentioned on p. 53. The animal on the Hephaistos krater, Louvre G 162 (p. 53), is a donkey, not a horse. Fig. 61 seems to be reversed.

The sculptor of the dying horse at Phigaleia (p. 119 and fig. 48) is not so daring as might have been thought. Like other bold motives at Phigaleia it is probably borrowed from some earlier sculpture. This is easy to say, and I might have given the sculptor the benefit of the doubt, did the motive not occur in almost exactly the same form on an Attic black-figured cup in Berlin (inv. 3755: Neugebauer, *Führer*, p. 64) which is not unrelated to the C Painter and cannot be later than 570-560: part of it is published by Schaal (*Sf.* pl. 19, 35), but not the battle-scene with the horses.

The author distinguishes three types of horse in the Greek world: the European, the Asiatic, and the Western. He warns the reader against accepting Ridgeway's conclusions without careful consideration (p. 3); but his 'Western' horse is really Ridgeway's 'Libyan', and his 'European' the 'small dun-coloured horse' which Ridgeway supposed to have been the original Greek and Homeric animal. Ridgeway's theories have been challenged by others; recently,

with much spirit, by Lady Wentworth in her *Thoroughbred Racing Stock* (1938), which is not in Markman's bibliography. I confine myself to a few observations on the question of colour. Ridgeway and Markman deny that the Homeric *ξανθός* could be applied to a chestnut horse, and translate 'dun'. When one thinks of the rough-and-ready use of colour-words not only in early literature but even nowadays (white wine; *souliers jaunes*; black men; red men; white men), one hesitates to assert that *ξανθός* could not have included chestnut. It is said that the Greeks had a word for chestnut, and it was not *ξανθός* but *παρώας* (p. 12): but even if *παρώας* was used for 'chestnut' in the fourth century, it does not follow that the same colour might not have been described as *ξανθός* in Homer. But is *παρώας* equivalent to chestnut? The word is believed to be the same as *παρείας*, the reddish-brown snake sacred to Asklepios: has this snake been identified? If it has, we should have been told so. Aristotle says of the European bison that *τὸ χρώμα ἔχει τι μέσον τεφροῦ καὶ πυρροῦ, οὐχ ὅλον αἱ παρώαι ἵπποι καλοῦμεναι*, where many editors omit *οὐχ*: is this an accurate description of chestnut? Was it perhaps a special shade or off-shade of chestnut?

Markman follows Ridgeway in supposing that the horses of the Sigynnai, north of the Danube, may have been 'the descendants of the original horses the Hellenes rode into the Greek peninsula' (pp. 4-6). It would have been desirable, from Ridgeway's point of view, that the horses of the Sigynnai should have been described as *ξανθοί*. Unfortunately Herodotus does not give their colour. Ridgeway and Markman think it possible or probable that they were *ξανθοί*. Why? Because horses of that colour were common throughout Greek history. Good argument.

Achilles' horse Balios, from his name, 'must have been a dappled dun horse, that is a piebald' (p. 5). How do we know that the ground in *βαλῖος* was always dun?

Plutarch in his biography of Pelopidas tells a story how instead of a

ma
wa
f
he
the
du
(
pe
un
red
Ric
see
Dic
bel
Ho
eith
Ric
tha
7
hor
col
12)
fam

Gise
G
tr
x
M
O
M
THE
best
fine
tokl
piec
Miss
Not
are
piec
the
The
of a
Yorl
of a
appe
perh
amp
of th
time
with
exce
459

maiden, a dun horse with a yellow mane was sacrificed.' What Plutarch says is ἡ χρῶα στῆθονα τῆς χαίτης πυρότατον: he says nothing about the body and there is no reason to suppose it was dun-coloured.

On p. 10 it is said that 'the exact appearance of the original Libyan horse is unknown, except that it was probably reddish-brown, that is, bay colored'. Ridgeway said so, but there does not seem to be any other evidence. One of Diomed's horses, which had formerly belonged to Aeneas, is described by Homer as φοῖνιξ (which 'must mean either bay or chestnut' according to Ridgeway, p. 291): but we are not told that it was a Libyan.

The account of the production of horses 'other than dun, white, and bay colours' by means of cross-breeding (p. 12) conflicts with the statements of a famous horse-breeder and ἵππογνώμων,

Lady Wentworth. Markman speaks of iron-grey as 'the natural result of crossing a dun with a bay': but according to Lady Wentworth to produce grey or white one parent at least must be of that colour. Nor is chestnut 'the result of mixed breeding'—it is a foundation colour.

Markman's account of the Parthenon horses will be read with interest even after Diehl's excellent work, *Die Reiter-schöpfungen der Phidiasischen Kunst*. He complains that in Selene's horse, and throughout the frieze, 'the lower jaw is so short that the lower lips would not meet the upper if the mouth were closed' (p. 71): this is a serious charge, and I am glad to learn from Lady Wentworth that it is unfounded: the jaw is simply pulled by the bit.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

Oxford.

ATTIC GRAVESTONES

Gisela M. A. RICHTER: *Archaic Attic Gravestones*. (Martin Classical Lectures, Oberlin College, vol. X.) Pp. xvi+160; 108 figures. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (for Oberlin College and the Metropolitan Museum of Art), 1944. Cloth, \$2.50.

THE tall slender tombstones of which the best-known example, though not the finest, is the stele of Aristion, by Aristokles, in Athens are so many masterpieces of archaic art. It is to these that Miss Richter's new book is devoted. Not one of them is complete, and many are small fragments only, but every piece, properly viewed, throws light on the rest, and receives light from them. The most nearly complete is the stele of a boy and his little sister, in New York, recently augmented by the statue of a sphinx that crowned it: the boy, it appears, may have been an Alcmaeonid, perhaps a Me[gakles]. Other fine examples are also in New York, and some of these are published here for the first time, among them a beautiful fragment with the head of a youth (Fig. 71) which excels even the brother-and-sister stele

and is a paragon of melodious line. Careful examination of a compact class of monuments is bound to have good results, and Miss Richter's handling of her material is masterly. She has a gift, too, for putting learned and technical matters in a clear, unpretentious, and agreeable way. Her book marks a great advance in our knowledge and understanding of archaic art. There are numerous illustrations from good photographs and drawings.

What was the meaning of the sphinxes that crowned sepulchral monuments? The question is asked, and tentatively answered, on p. 20. The tomb-sphinx was thought of primarily, one may suppose, as the guardian of the tomb: the tomb, however, was not only the structure in front of men's eyes, but also a part of the house or domain of Hades. An inscription from Thessaly, published in *Gnomon*, 14, p. 476, with comments by Peek and Paul Maas, though fragmentary, has some importance, for it must come from a tomb surmounted by a sphinx, and it belongs to the period of our stelai, the sixth century. It takes

the form of a dialogue between the passer-by and the sphinx. 'Sphinx, dog [that is, watchdog] of Hades [what man's remains, e.g.] dost thou sit and

guard?' 'Stranger,—', the Sphinx answers—but the rest is missing.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

Oxford.

DURA-EUROPOS

Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report IV, Part I, Fascicule I: *The Green Glazed Pottery*. By Nicholas TOLL. Pp. iv+95; 20 plates, 31 figures in text. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1943. Stiff paper, 13s. 6d. net.

ONE of the most serious limitations on our attempts to assess the Roman achievement is that our views of it are almost entirely taken from inside, to the exclusion of the far wider if also less significant world that lay outside it. Hence the importance of the ruins and remains of Dura-Europos on the Euphrates, midway between Baghdad and Aleppo, discovered by a British officer in 1921 and excavated and admirably published and interpreted by F. Cumont and M. Rostovtzeff and their colleagues of Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions. Europos was founded as a Hellenistic stronghold about 300 B.C., fell to the Parthians about 140 B.C., under whom it became a great caravan centre and revived the pre-Macedonian name of Dura, was reconquered by Trajan and turned into a frontier fortress, but reverted, probably before Trajan's death, to Parthia and became again a centre on the trade route between Parthia and Rome closely associated with Palmyra, was recovered for Rome by Lucius Verus, remained Roman under his successors and became a great military outpost of the empire till it was finally captured and destroyed by Sapor I of the Persian dynasty that had overthrown the Parthian power in A.D. 227.

The city thus epitomizes a whole important chapter in the relations between the civilizations of Macedon and Rome and that of their great Eastern neighbours of Parthia and Persia. The more sensational finds (which include fortifications, Pagan temples, Christian churches

and a Jewish synagogue, remarkable wall-paintings and a multitude of inscriptions, and justify Rostovtzeff's comparison with Pompeii) do not here concern us. An excellent account of them has been published by Rostovtzeff (*Dura-Europos and its Art*, Oxford, 1938). But on ancient sites the commonest of all finds and those which afford the best clues for chronological reconstruction and external contacts are pots and potsherds. The distinctive pottery of Dura-Europos is the green glazed ware that is the subject of the present most useful monograph. The ware has been known for some forty years under the name of Parthian. Its diffusion is contemporaneous with the expansion of the Parthian Empire: it started at least as early as the first century B.C. and continued till the city's destruction. The twenty plates and the greater part of the letterpress (pp. 7-69) give an illustrated description of the vases according to their shapes, some of which are distinctly reminiscent of Hellenistic. Preliminary sections are devoted to the finds, material, and technique of the vases, chronological evidence, and place of origin. The study concludes with technological notes by F. R. Matson, an expert on this side of the subject.

The whole report is an excellent piece of work; but, as the writers are the first to recognize, the study of this pottery is still in the pioneer stage. It is not so very long since explorers on Parthian sites when publishing their finds were content with brief references to the presence of green glazed sherds, nearly always without any indication of date (p. 71). As Mr. Matson observes in the final paragraph of the report, 'only as more individual sites are studied will comparative materials become available that will . . . make it possible to trace the technical history of ceramics in a

part
lar
tura
clea
wor
thor
been
from
but
The
the
an
'Pla
pott
accu
duri

Roge
'Le
THE
discu
histor
intern
ment
pessin
their
throu
value
the r
ently
never
contin
harm
Socra
or sp
unity
rise t
This
to be
chief
ism.
upset
Spart
obses
catast
of wh
doubt
count
The
fully
Plato
youth
who i
Dr.
suffers
rhetor
Also,
Greek
an en
period
glorio

part of the world where it is of particular archaeological significance and cultural importance'. The reviewer is not clear as to which are the parts of the world where the pottery finds need less thorough treatment than that which has been so rightly accorded to those from Dura-Europos in this monograph; but the statement shows the right spirit. The one criticism that might be made of the work concerns what seems like an isolated lapse from thoroughness. 'Plain single sherds of green glazed pottery', Mr. Toll tells us (p. 1), 'were accumulated in such large quantity that during recent years only those frag-

ments have been collected and catalogued which present a new type or supplied sufficient evidence for a reconstruction of the shape.' This is surely a deviation into the heresy of the museum piece. If pottery is to be used as historical evidence mere quantity is a matter of the utmost importance. A small shed would hold many plain wooden boxes and a blue pencil would be enough to label them 'green glazed sherds from Dura-Europos'. This one item of constructive criticism is offered as a tribute to what is indeed an admirable publication.

P. N. URE.

University of Reading.

SHORT REVIEWS

Roger GODEL: *Recherche d'une Foi*. Pp. 159. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1940. Paper, 25 fr.

THE purpose of the first essay in this book is to discuss how it was that the ancient Greeks, whose history during the classical period is so full of internecine wars, class-struggles, massacres, banishments, and piracy, never gave way to a facile pessimism but rose superior to the conditions of their daily life. In Dr. Godel's opinion they did so through their joy in life and their confidence in the value of human effort. In this they were aided by the realization that the Universe, though apparently suffering from a similar state of discord, nevertheless, shaken by tempests and earthquakes, continued its majestic progress in uninterrupted harmony. This idea of harmony inspired the pre-Socratic philosophers to inquire into the physical or spiritual essence which gave the Universe its unity, while, applied in the moral sphere, it gave rise to the typically Greek conception of Justice. This flowering of the Greek intellect was destined to be brief. The death-struggle between the two chief states of Greece engendered a fatal individualism. In Athens the degeneration of democracy upset the balance of classes and parties, while at Sparta the power passed into the hands of fanatics obsessed by the spirit of adventure. The final catastrophe came with the fall of Athens in 403 B.C., of which Dr. Godel gives a dramatic account, no doubt inspired by the humiliations which his own country has recently experienced.

The second essay, *Sur la jeunesse de Platon*, skilfully traces what must have been the reactions of Plato to the historical events of his childhood and youth, and in particular to the rule of the Thirty, who included relatives of his own.

Dr. Godel's book is not without interest but suffers somewhat from repetition and is written in a rhetorical style which is apt to become monotonous. Also, any reader ignorant of the development of Greek philosophy might conclude that it came to an end in 403 B.C., at the very moment when the period was beginning that was to witness its most glorious achievements.

E. S. FORSTER.

Guy SOURY, *Aperçus de Philosophie religieuse chez Maxime de Tyr, Platonicien éclectique*. Pp. 76. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1942. Paper, 40 fr.

THIS study is intended as complementary to the author's earlier work on the demonology of Plutarch. The analyses of the three dissertations (v, xii, xli, Hobein) here examined seem rather too meticulous; for though Maximus, like his contemporary Lucian and other authors, affords interesting testimony to the ideas afloat in the period of the decline of ancient philosophy and religion, his work does not repay detailed dissection. It owes in fact, too little to logic and too much to the more vicious kind of rhetoric with its love for a deceptive symmetry of exposition. Soury is well aware that Maximus rarely keeps to the thread of his discourse and regularly spoils his themes, which as a rule look very promising, by inconsequential treatment. His chief concern is to point out many parallel passages to the contents of these dissertations, which draw from a traditional stock of anecdotes and platitudes on prayer, providence, fate and chance, and on evil as caused by human perversity and the recalcitrance of matter. He also seeks to trace their affiliations with Stoicism, Cynic pessimism, and the Platonizing belief in the potential divinity of man. Maximus must, of course, be used with caution as a witness to other people's views; his faithfulness to his sources might not unfairly be illustrated by the fact that in the very act of recalling Plato (*Rep.* ii) on the uses of falsehood he both denies and ignores Plato's argument that the gods do not deceive. Many of Soury's parallels (there are many others which could be adduced) were, however, well worth noting: for example, the verbal affinities between Maximus and pseudo-Aristotle *De Mundo* on the argument for the existence of God drawn from the beauty of the universe.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

William A. MAAT: *A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. lxxi.) Pp. vi+86. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1944. Paper.

THIS is a classified catalogue of some fifty rhetorical figures—alliteration, anadiplosis, anastrophe, antimetathesis, *et hoc genus omne* (except metaphor and comparison)—with quotations of representative examples of each figure and (usually) a count of its frequency in each ten-page section of the *De Sacerdotio* and a comparison of the total with the corresponding total for the 'Homilies on the Statues' (xxii of this series); on these data is based a brief estimate of the extent to which Chrysostom's use of each figure betrays the influence of the Second Sophistic style. The author is not to be blamed because the title of his book, which he uses also as the title of his final (four-page) chapter, could be mistaken to promise a more comprehensive account of Chrysostom's style than he does in fact provide. Within its own scope the work shows clearly enough that Chrysostom was no slave to the rhetorical fashions of his day. But mastery means more than freedom; the greatness of a writer is not to be measured by the number of his tools or the frequency with which he uses any of them, but, a little, by their quality and, most of all, by the quality of the use he makes of them. On this, for the most part, the author is wisely silent; for the words 'The figure <sc. hyperbaton> immediately attracts attention and helps to attain emphasis, but very frequently it is purely artistic and gives an appearance of affectation' could hardly have been written by anyone with much sense of the nature and quality of literary art. Hence the present work does less to explain the Christian saint's claim to be called Chrysostom than to justify the author's title to the epithet that the pagans bestowed on Didymus.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

Sister M. Jamesetta KELLY, O.P.: *Life and Times as Revealed in the Writings of St. Jerome Exclusive of His Letters*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. lxx.) Pp. xviii+176. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1944. Paper.

SISTER KELLY assembles what Jerome tells us of natural features, agriculture, the professions and crafts, trade, population, land tenure, marriage, slavery, dwellings, amusements, education, administration, the army, and the barbarians. The sketch of religious life (chap. 4) is perhaps out of place, since the purpose of the thesis is to amass detail.

The result can be given in the author's words: 'Many interesting features of contemporary living have come into view before us, but on the whole

we cannot say, except in two or three instances, that there are phases of life in the fourth and fifth centuries about which we would be totally ignorant if St. Jerome had not mentioned them.' I have not identified the two or three 'phases of life', but points of interest to the historian are the cannibalism of the Atticotti (*Adv. Jovin.* ii. 7) and the military ranks (*c. Joh.* 19).

Though, given the prolixity of the Fathers, Sister Kelly's intentions are excellent, her judgement is poor and her knowledge, linguistic and critical, quite inadequate, despite her Ph.D. Not until p. 130 does she warn us against legendary material in the life of Hilary which she has been using throughout; no such warning is given about the freely quoted, but even more dubious, *Vita Pauli*, which, moreover, if it is not a romance, concerns the third century. Frequently what Jerome derives from earlier writers is bundled in as evidence for his own day. She says that Jerome mentions over twenty-five Christian writers, whereas the *De Viris Illustribus* alone gives 135.

Mistranslations are numerous. On p. 72 *membranis* is translated 'coverings', missing the point, while *mihi meisque . . . pauperis (schedulas)* becomes 'I and my poor friends'. On p. 94, by a mere howler, a Prefect disclaims Arianism instead of a Bishop. Carelessness alone will not account for the misprints. In the Latin on pp. 5-8 there are five errors, on pp. 12-14 five, on pp. 19-23 eight—and so on. In note 218 *ut verum* is printed *tu veram*; *adhoriente* becomes *abhorrente*. I checked seven references at random: three were wrong.

S. L. GREENSLADE.

University of Durham.

E. H. BLAKENEY: *Between Times*. Pp. 20. Winchester: printed by the Author at his private press, 1944. Paper. Twenty-five copies only printed.

THIS little book contains thirty pieces in all. Of these five are original poems, four of which made their first appearance in the author's editions of classical works. Twenty are translations from the Greek, including such well-known passages as Simonides *On those who fell at Thermopylae*, Euripides *Hippolytus*, 73 ff., Plato *To Aster*, and Moschus iii. 199 ff. The remainder are three of them from the Latin, including Hadrian *Ad animam suam*, one from the French, and one from the Japanese.

Of the original pieces, that on Horace is particularly happy. Of the versions from the Greek, Plato's little epigram, which has had so many translators, including Shelley, may be quoted:

My Star, that starward gazest, O to be
Yon heaven, with myriad eyes to gaze on thee!

The author-printer is to be congratulated on the typography of this little book.

E. S. FORSTER.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XL. 3: JULY, 1945

E. J. Bickerman, *Bellum Philippicum: Some Roman and Greek Views concerning the Causes of the Second Macedonian War*: examines and relates the annalistic (Livian) and Polybian accounts. C. Roebuck, *Messenian Economy and Population*: surveys the evidence. F. Steckerl, *Plato, Hippocrates and the Menon Papyrus*: Phaedrus 270 c ff. and the Menon pap. (Diels, *Supp. Ar.*, p. 8, ll. 35 ff.) point to the Hippocratic authorship of $\pi. \alpha\rho\chi\alpha\iota\varsigma \iota\eta\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$. G. M. Bolling, *Movable Nu at the End of Homeric Verses*: from the evidence of the papyri concludes that in the earlier period $\nu \epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ was always written at the ends of lines, which suggests declamation with a pause after each line: the rule that ν is written only when the next line begins with a vowel was due to Alexandrian influence. D'A. W. Thompson, *The Greek for a Dormouse*: Photius, Hesychius, and Suidas point to $\phi\epsilon\rho\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ as a name for the dormouse, perhaps a corruption by *Volksetymologie* of a word cognate with O.H.G. *pūh*, O.Ch.Slav. *plūchū*.

XL. 4: OCTOBER, 1945

C. H. Beeson, *The Collectaneum of Hadaard*: argues that the MS. was written by the compiler H. himself, probably at Tours in the tenth century; examines its relation to the textual tradition of Cicero. K. von Fritz, *Noûs, voûv and their Derivatives in Pre-Socratic Philosophy*, I: discusses usage in Xenophanes, Heraclitus, and Parmenides (for whom $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is not, as for his predecessors, purely intuitional understanding but includes logical reasoning). O. J. Todd, *Charon the Portitor*: the change of meaning from 'customs officer to 'carrier' was probably due to misunderstanding of Virgil, *G.* 4. 502 and *A.* 6. 298, 306: V. meant Charon to be a kind of immigration officer, not merely the ferryman of legend. C. A. Lynch on Tac. *Ann.* 13. 26 attempts to solve a well-known crux by reading *an verberibus* for *ac v.*, assuming not only suppression of the main verb but an unlikely change from indirect to direct speech.

L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Tome IX (1940). F. Cumont, *Une Pierre tombale érotique de Rome*. S. J. De Loret, *Le Rang social du primipile à l'époque d'Auguste et de Tibère*. G. Goossens, *L'Histoire d'Assyrie de Ctésias*. E. Liénard, *Obscurités d'Hygin*. J. Capart, *L'Amphibryon de Plaute d'après un thème égyptien*. A. J.

Van Windekens, *Notes sur l'étymologie de deux mots grecs* ($\omega\delta\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\varsigma$).

Chroniques: *Histoire religieuse de l'Espagne antique* (G. Heuten); *La Question étrusque* (M. Renard); *Archéologie*, 1940 (J. Breuer, H. Van de Weerd).

Tome X (1941). A. Carnoy, *Le Nom des Ioniens*. R. Crahay, *Les Moralistes anciens et l'avortement*. E. de Strycker, *De irrationalen in den Hippias Minor*. R. Henrion, *Des origines du mot Familia* (I). P. Lambrechts, *Note sur une Statuette en bronze de Mercure au Musée de Tongres*. G. Mathieu, *Peut-on dater Iphigénie en Tauride?* R. van Pottelbergh, *Bij een aristotelianische Aporie* (Poet. 1448^b34). J. Bidez, *La Métapsychique dans l'Antiquité*. J. Gessler, *Notes lexicographiques latino-médiévales* (I).

Chroniques: *La VII^e Campagne de fouilles à Apamée* (H. Lacoste: with plates); *Archéologie*, 1941 (J. Breuer, H. Van de Weerd).

Tome XI. 1 (1942). P. Boyancé, *Sur le Songe de Scipion*. P. Cloché, *La Politique extérieure d'Athènes de 462 à 454 av. J.C.* (I). S. J. De Laet, *Figurines en terre cuite de l'époque romaine trouvées à Assche-Kalkhoven*. M. van den Bruwaene, *Traces de Posidonius dans le premier livre des Tusculanes*. J. Gessler, *Notes lexicographiques latino-médiévales* (II). L. Herrmann, *La Date du festin de Trimalchion*. R. Goossens, *Une Allusion à Cimon dans le Πολιτικός d'Antiphon* [fr. 76: Eupolis, fr. 208 K.]. P. Gilbert and M. Renard, *Les Dates de naissance et de mort de Catulle* [87, 57 B.C.].

Chroniques: *Une Nouvelle Défense de l'Epinomis* (E. des Places); *Archéologie*, 1942. 1.

Tome XI. 2 (1942). A. Carnoy, *Les Éléments latins dans la toponymie de la Flandre*. P. Cloché, *La Politique extérieure d'Athènes de 462 à 454 av. J.C.* (II). M. Amand, *Quelques résultats des fouilles archéologiques de Tournai (1941-1942)* (I). R. Henrion, *Des origines du mot Familia* (II). J. Van Windekens, *Contribution à l'étude de la morphologie grecque et latine*.

Chronique: *Archéologie*, 1942.

Tome XII (1943). H. Bardou, *Mécanisme et stéréotypie dans le style de Sénèque le Rhéteur*. A. Boutemy, *Une Œuvre inconnue d'un émule liégeois de Guido delle Colonne*. G. de Schaetzen, *Découvertes romaines à Tongres en 1937*. R. Goossens, *Gloses indiennes dans le lexique d'Hésychius*. L. Lacroix, *A propos d'une prétendue copie de statue sur un stathère de Mallos*. J. Ruelens, *Les Saisons dans les Bucoliques de Virgile: chronologie et composition*. M. Amand, *Fouilles de Tournai* (II).

Chroniques: *Le H hittite et les phonèmes laryngaux en indo-européen* (W. Couvreur); *Archéologie*, 1943.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Axelsson (B.)** Textkritisches zu Florus, Minucius Felix und Arnobius. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund Årsberättelse, 1944-45, I.) Pp. 67. Lund: Gleerup, 1944. Paper.
- Beazley (J. D.)** Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens. Pp. 43; 8 plates. (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXX.) London: Oxford University Press, 1945. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Blakeney (E. H.)** Between Times: Gleanings by the Wayside. Pp. 16. Winchester: printed by the author, 1944. Paper.
- Bonnard (G.)** Le Journal de Gibbon à Lausanne, 17 août 1763-19 avril 1764. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lausanne, VIII.) Pp. 326; 5 plates. Lausanne: Librairie de l'Université, 1945. Paper, 18 Sw. fr.
- Buch (C. D.) and Petersen (W.)** A Reversed Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives, arranged by terminations, with brief historical introductions. Pp. xvii+768. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1945. Cloth, 60s. net.
- Cahn (H. A.)** Die Münzen der sizilischen Stadt Naxos. (Basler Studien zur Kunstgeschichte, II.) Pp. 168; 12 plates. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1944. Paper, 9 Sw. fr.
- Carmina Hoefftiana.** (1) Weller (H.) Templum Divini Spiritus. Pp. 16. 1941. (2) Weller (H.) Dismas. Pp. 17. 1942. (3) Genovesi (V.) Taedium Vitae; Weller (H.) Peregrina. Pp. 18. 1943. Amsterdam: Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen. Paper.
- Cary (E.)** Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman Antiquities. Volume V (Books VIII-IX. 24). (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. 378. London: Heinemann, 1945. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Clarke (M. L.)** Greek Studies in England, 1700-1830. Pp. 255. Cambridge: University Press, 1945. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Dahl (A.)** Augustin und Plotin. Philosophische Untersuchungen zum Trinitätsproblem und zur Nuslehre. Pp. 117. Lund: Lindstedt, 1945. Paper.
- de Jonge (B. J.)** Ad Apulei Madaurensis Metamorphoseon librum secundum commentarius exegeticus. Pp. 131. Groningen: de Waal, 1941. Paper.
- Duchemin (J.)** L'áywv dans la tragédie grecque. (Collection des Études Anciennes.) Pp. 346. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper.
- Duggan (M.)** P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Lib. VI. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Pp. xxvii+172. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1945. Boards, 2s. 3d. net.
- Excavations at Dura-Europos.** Final Report IV. Part II: The Textiles. By R. Pfister and L. Bellinger. Pp. viii+64; 34 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.
- Festugière (A. J.)** La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. I: L'Astrologie et les sciences occultes. Pp. xii+423. Paris: Gabalda, 1944. Paper.
- Foley (R.)** P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Lib. III. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Pp. xxiv+162. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1945. Boards, 2s. 3d. net.
- Goldschmidt (R. C.)** Paulinus' Churches at Nola. Texts, translations, and commentary. Pp. 203. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1940. Paper, 9s. 6d. net.
- Gren (E.)** Kleinasien und der Ostbalkan in der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der römischen Kaiserzeit. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1941: 9.) Pp. xl+172. Uppsala: Lundequvist, 1941. Paper, 7 kr.
- Grimal (P.)** Frontin: Les Aqueducs de la ville de Rome. Texte établi, traduit et commenté. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 113; map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1944. Paper, 35 fr.
- Hesperia.** Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XIV, No. 3. July-September, 1945. Pp. 157-277: 2 plates. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1945. Paper, \$1.75.
- Jasny (N.)** The Wheats of Classical Antiquity. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXII, No. 3.) Pp. 176; 2 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. Paper, \$1.75.
- Kerényi (K.)** Die Geburt der Helena. Samt humanistischen Schriften aus den Jahren 1943-45. (Albae Vigiliae, N.F., Heft III.) Pp. 139. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1945. Paper, 8 Sw. fr.
- Kerényi (K.)** Hermes der Seelenführer. (Albae Vigiliae, N.F., Heft I.) Pp. 111. Zürich; Rhein-Verlag, 1944. Paper.
- Kerényi (K.)** Prometheus: das griechische Mythologem von der menschlichen Existenz. (Albae Vigiliae, N.F., Heft IV.) Pp. 82. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1946. Paper, 6 Sw. fr.
- Kerényi (K.)** Romandichtung und Mythologie. Ein Briefwechsel mit Thomas Mann. (Albae Vigiliae, N.F., Heft II.) Pp. 95. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1945. Paper.
- Koyré (A.)** Discovering Plato. Translated by L. R. Rosenfield. Pp. ix+119. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Lattimore (R.)** Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XXVIII, Nos. 1-2.) Pp. 355. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1942. Paper, \$3.
- Lavarenne (M.)** Prudence. Tome II: Apotheosis, Hamartigénie. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xv+81. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper, 70 fr.

Loy (C)
open
Wes
N.Y
Univ
Loene
mun
Holl
Louis
Pari
Louis
xxii
Pape
Lulofs
Libe
Theo
+ 10
dijk
Muske
ficat
Gron
Nahm
Pres
Harj
Norber
Norber
Pp.
Pape
Norber
qu'u
cons
qvist
Norber
reno
l'ode
Arss
quist
Norber
Gebi
latei
9.)
Pape
Norwoo
Vol.
sity
Opstello
Pessi
1945
Ormon
Proc
XXI
Univ
Papyro
Papy
Papy
6 pla
E. P
1941
scrib
Pestalo
Pp.
Pape
Philipp
map
Pape
Ponger
römi
stän

- Livy* (E.) *Pauli Sententiae. A Palingenesia of the opening Titles as a Specimen of Research in West Roman Vulgar Law.* Pp. xii+131. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.
- Loenen* (D.) *Protagoras and the Greek Community.* Pp. 129. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij. Paper, 9s. 6d. net.
- Louis* (P.) *Albinos: Épitomé.* Pp. xxxiii+184. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper, 200 fr.
- Louis* (P.) *Les Métaphores de Platon.* Pp. xxii+269. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper, 250 fr.
- Lulofs* (H. J. D.) *Aristotelis De Somno et Vigilia Liber adiectis veteribus translationibus et Theodori Metochitae commentario.* Pp. xxxvii+10 (double) +46; 4 plates. Leiden: Burgersdijk & Niermans, 1943. Paper.
- Muskens* (G. L.) *De Vocis ἀναλογία Significatione ac Usu apud Aristotelem.* Pp. 99. Groningen: Wolters, 1943. Paper.
- Nahm* (M. C.) *Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions.* Pp. xiii+554. New York: Harper, 1946. Cloth, \$4.50.
- Norberg* (D.) *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax.* Pp. 133. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1944. Paper, kr. 7.
- Norberg* (D.) *'Faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un': recherches sur l'origine latine de la construction romane.* Pp. 52. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1943. Paper.
- Norberg* (D.) *L'Olympionique, le poète et leur renom éternel: contribution à l'étude de l'ode I, 1 d'Horace.* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1945: 6.) Pp. 42. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1945. Paper, kr. 1.75.
- Norberg* (D.) *Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlateins und des frühen Mittelaltens.* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1943: 9.) Pp. 283. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1943. Paper, kr. 10.50.
- Norwood* (G.) *Pindar.* (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. XIX.) Pp. 302. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1945. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Opstelen* (J. C.) *Sophocles en het Griekse Pessimisme.* Pp. xvi+226. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1945. Paper.
- Ormonde Maddock Dalton*, 1866-1945. (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXXI.) Pp. 19; portrait. London: Oxford University Press, 1945. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava.* I. *The Warren Papyri.* Pp. 74; 6 plates. II. *Einige Wiener Papyri.* Bearbeitet von E. Boswinkel. Pp. 76; 6 plates. IIIa. *Some Oxford Papyri.* Edited by E. P. Wegener. Text. Pp. 93. Leiden: Brill, 1941, 1942, 1942. Paper, 15, 15, 25 (to subscribers 12, 12, 20) gulden.
- Pestalossi* (H.) *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias.* Pp. 52. Erlbach, Zürich: Rentsch, 1945. Paper, 7 Sw. fr.
- Philippson* (P.) *Thessalische Mythologie.* Pp. 196; map, 1 plate. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1945. Paper.
- Ponger* (C. S.) *Katalog der griechischen und römischen Skulptur, der steinernen Gegenstände und der Stuckplastik im Allard Pierson Museum zu Amsterdam.* Pp. xvi+103; 42 plates. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen, XI.) Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1942. Paper, 13s. net.
- Rackham* (H.) *Pliny: Natural History. Volume IV (Books XII-XVI).* (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp.; viii+556; London: Heinemann, 1945. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Robertson* (D. S.) *Apulée: Les Métamorphoses. Tome III (Livres VII-XI).* (Collection Budé.) Pp. 168 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945. Paper, 150 fr.
- Roux* (R.) *Les Alpes et les lettres grecques.* (From Comparative Literature Studies, Vol. XVI.) Pp. 4. Cardiff: Priory Press, 1945. Paper.
- Selwyn* (E. G.) *The First Epistle of St. Peter. The Greek Text with introduction, notes, and essays.* Pp. xvi+517. London: Macmillan, 1946. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Smiley* (C. N.) *Horace: his Poetry and Philosophy.* Pp. 42. New York: King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Paper, 6s. 6d. net.
- Spitsbarth* (A.) *Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechischen Tragödie.* Pp. 109. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1946. Paper, 7 Sw. fr.
- Steur* (P.) *Het Karakter van Hieronymus van Stridon bestudeerd in zijn brieven.* Pp. xi+234. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1945. Paper.
- Stoessl* (F.) *Der Tod des Herakles. Arbeitsweise und Formen der antiken Sagendichtung.* Pp. 128. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1945. Paper.
- Svennung* (J.) *Catulls Bildersprache. Vergleichende Stilstudien. I.* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1945: 3.) Pp. xi+147. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1945. Paper, 6 kr.
- Tierney* (M.) *Euripides: Hecuba.* Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Pp. xxvii+170. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1946. Cloth.
- Tobin* (M. D.) *Orientii Commonitorium. A Commentary with an introduction and a translation.* (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXIV.) Pp. xv+143. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1945. Paper.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.* Volume LXXV: 1944. To be ordered through B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford. Cloth.
- Trell* (B. L.) *The Temple of Artemis at Ephesos.* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 107.) Pp. xi+71: 39 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1945. Paper, \$2.
- Van der Wielen* (W.) *De Ideeëttallen van Plato.* Pp. xii+270. Amsterdam: D. B. Centen, 1941. Paper.
- Vandvik* (E.) *Genitivus und Ablativus Qualitatis.* (Avhandlingar utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1941, No. 2.) Pp. 115. Oslo: Dybwad, 1942. Paper, kr. 7.
- Vandvik* (E.) *The Prometheus of Hesiod and Aeschylus.* (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse,

- 1942, No. 2.) Pp. 84. Oslo: Dybwad, 1943. Paper, kr. 6.
- van Gulik* (H. C.) Catalogue of the Bronzes in the Allard Pierson Museum at Amsterdam. Part One. Pp. xvi+115; 36 plates. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen, VII.) Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1940. Paper, 13s. net.
- van Hall* (E.) Over den Oorsprung van de griekse Grafstele. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen, IX.) Pp. xiii+222. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1942. Paper, 10s. net.
- Van Hook* (L.) Isocrates. Volume III. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. x+524. London: Heinemann, 1945. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Verdenius* (W. J.) Parmenides: Some Comments on his Poem. Pp. 88. Groningen: Wolters, 1942. Paper.
- Wifstrand* (A.) *EIKOTA*: Emendationen und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit. V. Zu den Romanschriftstellern. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse, 1944-45, II.) Pp. 42. Lund: Gleerup, 1945. Paper.
- Zuntz* (G.) The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament. (British Academy: Supplemental Papers, VII.) Pp. 127. London: Oxford University Press, 1945. Paper, 12s. 6d. net.
- Zwicker* (W.) Studien zur Markussäule. I. Pp. 282; 2 folding maps. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen, VIII.) Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1941. Paper, 11s. 3d. net.

nents
lters,

und
n der
llern.
Lund
Lund:

New
mental
Uni-

. Pp.
hting,
VIII)
evers-